DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 438 858 JC 000 190

AUTHOR	Wen, Hung-yueh Daniel
TITLE	A Profile of Community College Presidents' Leadership Styles.
PUB DATE	1999-05-00
NOTE	113p.; Ph.D. Dissertation, Mississippi State University.
PUB TYPE	Dissertations/Theses - Doctoral Dissertations (041)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrator Behavior; *Administrator Effectiveness; *College Presidents; *Community Colleges; Leadership Qualities; *Leadership Styles; Self Concept; *Self Evaluation (Individuals); Two Year Colleges

ABSTRACT

This research study was designed to develop a profile of community college presidents' self-perceived leadership styles and to examine possible relationships between their perceived leadership styles and a number of variables that help describe organizational variations among different community colleges. The Leadership Effectiveness Adaptability Description Self (LEAD-Self) instrument was used to determine community college presidents' self-perceived leadership styles. The results, based on responses from 176 presidents, imply that there were no relationships existent between community college presidents' leadership styles and their personal/personnel characteristics such as the number of years at present position, total years of experience as college administrator, personal influence on organizational culture, etc. Also, there were no relationships existent between community college presidents' leadership styles and their institutional characteristics, such as single or multi-campus, number of full-time faculty, geographical region, etc. However, findings suggest that the longer the length of tenure a president has at his or her present college, the more likely he or she is to stick to one or two leadership styles. Also, community college presidents or campus CEOs who report they are more adaptable in their leadership styles feel they have more influence on the external communities served by their institutions. The study reveals that presidents with more years in administration perceived they are less adaptable in leadership style. Appendices include the letters and forms used in the study. (Contains 97 references.) (VWC)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Hung-yueh Daniel Wen

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

ED 438 858

A PROFILE OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE PRESIDENTS' LEADERSHIP STYLES

By

Hung-yueh Daniel Wen

A Dissertation
Submitted to the Faculty of
Mississippi State University
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy
in Education
in the Department of Educational Leadership

Mississippi State, Mississippi

May 1999

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A PROFILE OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE PRESIDENTS' LEADERSHIP STYLES

By

Hung-yueh Daniel Wen

A Dissertation
Submitted to the Faculty of
Mississippi State University
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy
in Education
in the Department of Educational Leadership

Mississippi State, Mississippi

May 1999

A PROFILE OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE PRESIDENTS'

LEADERSHIP STYLES

By

Hung-yueh Daniel Wen

Approved:

Ned B. Lovell
Professor, Head, and Graduate Coordinator of the Department of Educational Leadership
(Director of Dissertation)

Gary P. Johnson
Professor of Educational Leadership
(Committee Member)

Natalie Maynor
Professor of English
(Committee Member)

Jack G. Blendinger
Professor of Educational Leadership
(Committee Member)

James M. Weber
Associate Dean for Research and Development, College of Education,
Director of the Bureau of Educational Research and Evaluation
(Committee Member)

William H. Graves
Dean of the College of Education

Copyright by

Hung-yueh Daniel Wen

1999

Name: Hung-yueh Daniel Wen

Date of Degree: May 13, 1999

Institution: Mississippi State University

Major Field: Education (Educational Leadership)

Major Professor: Dr. Ned B. Lovell

Title of Study: A PROFILE OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE PRESIDENTS' LEADERSHIP STYLES

Pages in Study: 119

Candidate for Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

This research study was designed to develop a profile of community college presidents' self-perceived leadership styles and to examine possible relationships between their perceived leadership styles and a number of variables that help describe organizational variations among different community colleges. The Leader Effectiveness Adaptability Description Self (LEAD-Self) instrument was used to determine community college presidents' self-perceived leadership styles. Out of the population of 1,271 public community colleges across the country, the sample of 350 presidents/institutions was identified.

Of the 350 surveys mailed, 176 or 50.3% were returned. Independent t-tests and chi-square tests were first computed to compare the respondent sample with the population. Various statistical tests were then run to determine if there were any relationships between the leadership style characteristics of community college presidents

generated using the LEAD-Self and the organizational contexts at their respective institutions.

The data collected were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Science (SPSS) release 8.1. Frequency counts, descriptive statistics, two sets of one-way ANOVA, five chi-square tests, and two series of Pearson's product-moment correlations were employed to analyze the results. This study's data provide information that forms a profile of the nation's 1,271 community college presidents. The profile shows that community college presidents are predominately males, who have served as community college administrators for about 21 years, and have been at their present position for about eight years. They are mostly Selling or Participating leaders, reported having one or two secondary styles, flexible in their leadership style, and exhibit a moderate level of style adaptability.

The results imply that there were no relationships existent between community college presidents' leadership styles and their personal/personnel characteristics such as number of years at present position, total years of experience as a college administrator, personal influence on organizational culture, etc. Also, there were no relationships existent between community college presidents' leadership styles and their institutional characteristics such as single or multi-campus, number of full-time faculty, geographical region, etc. However, the findings suggest that the longer the length of tenure a president has at his/her present college, the more likely he/she is to stick to one or two leadership styles. The findings also suggest that community college presidents or campus CEOs who report they are more adaptable in their leadership styles feel they have more influence on the external communities served by their institutions. The findings also

reveal that presidents with more years in administration perceived they are less adaptable in leadership style.

DEDICATION

This degree is dedicated in memory of my dearest parents Chi-An and Ruei-Yu Hsu Wen.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The attainment of a doctoral degree is one of the most significant accomplishments of my lifetime. It has not come easy, nor has it been accomplished without the help and support of two institutions in Taiwan, National Science Council and National Taitung Teachers College, and other people. Without these institutions and individuals, this degree would have been impossible for me to attain.

I would like to express my sincere appreciation to the committee Chair, Department Head of Educational Leadership, Dr. Ned B. Lovell, for his encouragement and guidance throughout the years of my study at Mississippi State. I am also thankful to Dr. Jim Weber, a member of the committee, for his patience and encouragement guiding me on the statistical analyses and many insightful suggestions. I am also grateful to Dr. Gary Johnson, Dr. Jack Blendinger, and Dr. Natalie Maynor, for their assistance in developing the demographic questionnaire in the process of this study.

I want to express my heartfelt appreciation to my friends of Chinese Bible Study Group, Dr. Samuel and Maomi Chen, Dr. T. C. and Dr. Sue Lin Chen, Raymond and Gin Lin, and members of my church, Rev. John T. and Ann Smithson, Dr. Jerry and Barbara Rogers, and Adam Pearson for their immeasurable love and spiritual support.

I want to give my special thanks to Dr. Ruth Pao-yu Li, former college president in Taiwan, and Dr. Arnold Moore, former Dean of College of Education at MSU, for

their encouragement and support to make my study at Mississippi State become a reality. Having worked in her administration for six years, I found Dr. Li, herself, exhibited an effective and unique leadership style as a college president in one of the teachers colleges in Taiwan.

I also owe my thanks to my colleagues, Dr. Ming-cheng Du and Susan Du; with their assistance taking care of my household business in Taiwan, I could focus on my studies here in the United States.

I would like to thank all my professors and fellow doctoral students whose warmth and fellowship have enriched my studies at Mississippi State.

Finally, my deepest thanks go to my wife, Heng Chiang; without her encouragement and support, this endeavor would not have been possible. Thanks also go to my two boys, Jeff and Charlie. Their patience and understanding for all those times when Dad could not be there enabled me to continue my studies.

There are so many others, it would be difficult to list them all. Nevertheless, I do appreciate everyone's efforts to make my stay at Mississippi State and in Starkville rewarding and memorable. Thank the Lord!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

DEDICATION ii

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS iii

LIST OF TABLES vii

CHAPTER

I. NATURE AND SCOPE OF STUDY 1

Introduction 1
Statement of Problem 4
Theoretical Basis of Study 4
Statement of Purpose 7
Research Questions 7
Significance of Study 8
Limitations 9
Delimitations 10
A Brief Description of Methods and Procedures 10
Definition of Terms 11
Summary 13

II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE 15

Development of Leadership Theories 15
Community College Presidency 33
College Program Priority 45
Collective Bargaining 46
Leader-Follower Relationship 47
Summary 49

III. METHODS AND PROCEDURES 50

Introduction 50
Research Questions 50

CHAPTER Page

Research Design 52
Instrumentation 52
Validity and Reliability—LEAD-Self 54
Population 55
Procedure 56
Analysis of Data 57

IV. RESULTS OF THE STUDY 60

Introduction 60
Survey Responses 61
Descriptive Information 62
Comparison of Respondent Sample with Population 64
Analysis of Research Questions 68
Summary of Findings 81

V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS 84

Introduction 84
Summary of Procedures 86
Conclusions and Implications 88
Recommendations for Policy Changes and Future Research 96
Summary 98

REFERENCES 101

APPENDIX

A. INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD PERMISSION FORM 109

B. PERMISSION LETTER FOR USE OF LEAD-SELF 111

C. DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SHEET 113

D. LETTER TO COMMUNITY COLLEGE PRESIDENTS/CAMPUS CEOS 116

E. FOLLOW-UP LETTER 118

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE Page

1. Official Titles of the Respondents 62

2. Number of Campuses at the Respondents' Institutions 63

3. Self-Reported Decision-Making Style on Demographic Information Sheet 64

4. Comparison of Respondent Sample with Population on Degree of Urbanization 65

5. Comparison of Respondent Sample with the Population on Percentages of Minority Students 66

6. Comparison of Respondent Sample with Population on Student Enrollment 67

7. Comparison of Respondent Sample with Population on Region 68

8. Profile of Community College Presidents' Leadership Styles by LEAD-Self 71

9. ANOVA Analyses for Institutional Variables 75

10. ANOVA Analyses for Personal and Personnel Variables 76

11. Correlations of Institutional Variables and the Three Other Leadership Style Characteristics 78

12. Correlations of Personal and Personnel Variables to the Three Selected Leadership Characteristics 79

13. Profile of Community College CEOs 89

14. Community College Presidents' Decision-making Style Reported on DIS and Primary Leadership Styles Measured by LEAD-Self 94

CHAPTER I

NATURE AND SCOPE OF STUDY

Introduction

The community college movement of the 20th century has been one of the major innovations occurring in higher education in the U.S. This movement began the transformation of the U.S. population into a learning society in which any person who wishes to do so can study almost any subject in almost any geographical region (Deegan, Tillery, & Associates, 1985). The United States is becoming the nation with the best educated citizens in the world and was the first to strive for universal access to postsecondary education.

According to Cohen and Brawer (1996), there are approximately 1,250 community colleges in the United States. The number of these institutions doubled and the enrollment quadrupled between 1965 and 1980. Today, community colleges enroll more than 5 million credit students, representing almost half of all undergraduates in the United States. Nearly 55% of all first-time freshmen begin their higher education in a community college (Pierce, 1997).

The philosophy of community colleges has focused on the ideas of: (a) equal access to educational opportunities regardless of race, sex, socioeconomic status; (b) changing curricula that meet community needs; and (c) life-long learning (Cohen &

Brawer, 1996). According to Pierce (1996), the proper role of the community college also includes community development. The goal of the community college is not simply to weave together a few traditional transfer or vocational programs, balanced by the occasional non-credit or contract course. Rather, "its goal should be to use its unique position to bring together members from all walks of the community, to help them reach consensus on critical local needs, and then to marshal local resources to implement cost-effective, accountable solutions" (Pierce, 1996, p. 31).

Originally designed to provide the first two years of college, community colleges have become complex institutions providing a comprehensive range of credit and non-credit programs in response to changing societal needs (Baker, 1994). Today community colleges are playing an important role educating nearly half of all students in higher education. Community colleges are doing their best to accomplish several of their basic functions—undergraduate education, workforce training and retraining, remedial programming, general education, and personal enrichment (Deegan et al., 1985). Transfer programs prepare students for upper-division work. Vocational programs prepare students for entry-level jobs, as well as retraining for advancement in their chosen occupations. Remedial programs ameliorate past educational inequities and prepare students for citizenship, family life, cultural and esthetic appreciation, and lifelong learning. Heading for the 21st century, community colleges today are trying to reconfirm this comprehensive mission as they try to respond appropriately to the educational needs of a wide range of people and organizations.

The community college and its philosophy that everyone should have equal access to educational opportunities are important to every state in the United States (Cohen & Brawer, 1996). Community colleges are vital in terms of serving the needs of a state that is economically disadvantaged or geographically separated into rural areas (Young, 1993). Many individuals would be unable to go beyond the secondary level of education without the availability of community colleges. Community college presidents help to chart the educational, social, and economic life of thousands of communities across the nation. They lead institutions that enroll approximately 5 million students in credit courses each year and serve an estimated 4 million individuals in noncredit activities. Many of these students are from lower socioeconomic groups and many are minorities and women, groups whose members might not be able to attend college if community colleges did not exist. The men and women who serve as presidents of the nation's public community colleges head schools that spend billions of dollars each year and employ approximately 270,000 full-time faculty, librarians, counselors, and administrators, as well as a large number of support staff and part-time faculty (Vaughan, 1986). These presidents' leadership affects curriculum, organization, student services, as well as the morale and mood of an institution. The mood of an institution, through its effect on students, can even indirectly help determine the mood of society (Vaughan, 1986).

Statement of Problem

Studies done on similar topics in higher education have focused on the position of community college department chairs (Coats, 1996; Law, 1995), community college district vocational directors (Young, 1993), college administrators (Yang, 1994), and community college athletic coaches (Wardell, 1977). A great number of research studies have analyzed the college or university presidency, yet no national studies have been found that are focused on community college presidents' leadership styles and the relationships between those presidents' leadership styles and different organizational contexts. Therefore, a study that develops a national profile of community college presidents' leadership styles and the relationships between presidential leadership styles and organizational contexts represents a research focus that needs to be addressed.

Theoretical Basis of Study

This research study makes use of Hersey and Blanchard's (1988) Situational Leadership Theory as the general theoretical framework for conceptualizing leadership style. Their theory is based on two key leadership behaviors: (a) task behaviors and (b) relationship behaviors. Using task behavior, the leader exhibits one-way communication by explaining what each follower is to do, as well as when, where, and how the tasks are to be performed. The use of relationship behavior requires the leader to engage in two-way communication by providing socio-emotional support, "psychological strokes," and " facilitating" behaviors (p. 117).

Within the Hersey and Blanchard model there are four basic leadership styles which combine both relationship behavior and task behavior: (a) telling, (b) selling, (c) participating, and (d) delegating. The Situational Leadership Theory of Hersey and Blanchard (1988) is an extension of Tannenbaum and Schmidt's (1973) leadership-style continuum, Blake and Mouton's (1985) Managerial Grid, and Reddin's (1970) three-dimensional leadership styles.

The Situational Leadership Theory, which relates appropriate behavior of leaders to the maturity of followers, evolved from earlier studies at the Ohio State University and the University of Michigan. The objective of the Ohio State leadership studies was to identify the different dimensions of leader behavior (Bensimon, Neumann, & Birnbaum, 1989). Two essential aspects of leadership behavior were identified, initiating structure and consideration. Initiating structure was defined as the extent to which a leader organizes and specifies the way a job is to be done. Consideration, on the other hand, describes the extent to which a leader shows concern for the welfare of the workers. Leadership studies at the University of Michigan were directed at attempting to identify groups of leadership characteristics related to each other and identify leadership effectiveness indicators (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 1991). Two dimensions of distinct leadership behaviors were identified as production-centered and employee-centered, similar to the dimensions of initiating-structure and consideration of the Ohio State studies. The production-centered leader emphasizes employee tasks and the methods used to accomplish them. An employee-centered leader emphasizes employees' personal needs and the development of

interpersonal relationships. Grouping the characteristics of leader behaviors allowed for leaders to be described on a continuum as being task or authoritarian in nature or democratic which was relationship-oriented.

Following the lead of the earlier Ohio State studies and the Michigan studies, Hersey and Blanchard (1988) identified two key leadership behaviors, task behavior and relationship behavior as mentioned before. Hersey and Blanchard incorporated the maturity of followers as a key situational variable in the model. They saw two types of maturity as particularly important, job maturity and psychological maturity. Job maturity refers to a person's maturity to perform the job as influenced by education and experience. Psychological maturity refers to a person's level of motivation as reflected in achievement needs and willingness to accept responsibility.

The key for leadership effectiveness in Hersey and Blanchard's model is to match the situation with the appropriate leadership style. Among the four basic leadership styles in the model, the telling style is a high-task, low-relationship style and is effective when subordinates are low in motivation and ability. The selling style is a high-task, high-relationship style and is effective when subordinates have adequate motivation but low ability. The participating style is a low-task, high-relationship style and is effective when subordinates have adequate ability but low motivation. The delegating style is a low-task, low-relationship style and is effective when subordinates are very high in ability and motivation.

Statement of Purpose

The purpose of this study was to develop a profile of community college presidents' leadership styles. Specific goals of the study were (a) to assess the community college presidents' self-perceived leadership styles; and (b) to examine if there are relationships between self-perceived leadership styles of community college presidents and the organizational contexts of their institutions.

Research Questions

This research study developed a profile of community college presidents' self-perceived leadership styles and examined the relationships between self-perceived leadership styles and a number of variables that help describe organizational variations among different community colleges. The following research questions served as a basis for conducting this study.

1. What is the profile of community college presidential leadership styles across the nation as perceived by the presidents themselves in response to the Leader Effectiveness and Adaptability Description (LEAD) Self?

2. Are there any significant relationships between self-perceived leadership styles of community college presidents and the organizational contexts existent at their institutions, where organizational context is operationally defined by the following two sets of variables:

(a) Institutional Characteristics
- (1) Number of full time faculty
- (2) Single or multi-campus
- (3) Degree of urbanization
- (4) Geographical region
- (5) Approximate annual budget for Liberal Arts/College Transfer, Vocational/Occupational Training, and Non-Credit/Workforce Development
- (6) Whether or not there is collective bargaining agreement in place
- (7) Student enrollment

(b) Personal/Personnel Characteristics
- (1) Number of years at present position
- (2) Total number years of experience as a college administrator
- (3) Decision making style reported on DIS
- (4) Personal influence on organizational culture
- (5) Personal influence on external community
- (6) Perceived friendliness of work group
- (7) Perceived helpfulness of work group in getting the job done
- (8) Trust in the group

Significance of Study

There is no formula for successful presidential leadership. Green (1986) pointed out that leadership always is situational—an era, a context, or a particular set of circumstances calls for one kind of leadership; a different context calls for another. Green's concept of leadership style is congruent with Hersey and Blanchard's situational theory. Both believe that the key for leadership effectiveness is to match the situation with the appropriate leadership style.

The results of this proposed study, within the frame of Hersey and Blanchard's leadership styles, will provide a national profile of leadership styles of current community college presidents. This profile will provide reference information for researchers as well as provide a benchmark for future studies. The

data generated from this study could be helpful in the development and/or refinement of professional training programs.

Recent research has linked leadership style of community college presidents with personal characteristics, stress (Riley, 1990), burnout (Gubanich, 1991), and community involvement (Sheffield, 1996). These studies have focused either on a certain region of the country—northwest, southeast, west coast (California), or on the big cities—eastern metropolitan areas like New York. No similar study has been national in scope. Therefore, this proposed study will be significant because it provides a national profile of community college presidents' leadership styles and additional documentation regarding the perceived leadership style of community college presidents and the organizational contexts of institutions.

Limitations

There are at least three limitations of this research study:

1. The results of this study are only generalized to community college presidents employed at the time of the study (1998).

2. The information gathered in the study is limited as to individual president biases and prejudices in the perceptions of her/her own leadership style.

3. Since the data of this study were collected mainly by mail, general limitations are similar to those common to most survey research studies. Also there is limited control over participant response rates (Fowler, 1988).

Delimitations

There are at least three delimitations of this study:

1. Leadership style as perceived by the respondents in the study is defined and limited by Hersey & Blanchard's constructs and items contained in the Leader Effectiveness Adaptability Description Self (LEAD-Self).

2. Community colleges referred to in the study are limited to those located in the United States.

3. This study is not used to measure the effectiveness or accomplishments of community college presidents.

A Brief Description of Methods and Procedures

The descriptive research design was used in this study. This study focused on developing a profile of community college presidents' leadership styles and examined the relationships between the leadership styles and the organizational contexts of their institutions. Included in this study were college presidents or campus CEOs from 350 of the 1,271 public community colleges located in the United States. A mail questionnaire was used as the data gathering instrument. The LEAD-Self (Hersey, 1993) was used to identify the presidents' leadership styles. A demographic questionnaire (DIS) was used to gather information about the relevant variables to determine the organizational contexts and their possible relationships to leadership styles. Descriptive statistics, one-way analyses of variance (ANOVA), chi-square tests, and Pearson product-moment correlations were used to analyze the data.

Definition of Terms

For purposes of this study, the following definitions were used:

1. Profile: A summary or analysis of data generated by the national study of perceived leadership styles of community college presidents.

2. Leadership style: This term refers to the manner in which the leader influences subordinates. The dominant leadership style as perceived by the college faculty is measured by Hersey's LEAD-Self. The instrument identifies the four leadership styles as follows: S1—Telling Style, High Task and Low Relationship; S2—Selling Style, High Task and High Relationship; S3—Participating Style, Low Task and High Relationship; and S4—Delegating Style, Low Task and Low Relationship (Hersey & Blanchard, 1988).

3. Task behavior: The extent to which leaders are likely to organize and define the roles of the members of their group (followers); to explain what activities each is to do and when, where, and how tasks are to be accomplished; characterized by endeavoring to establish well-defined patterns of organization, channels of communication, and ways of getting jobs accomplished (Hersey & Blanchard, 1988).

4. Relationship behavior: The extent to which leaders are likely to maintain personal relationships between themselves and members of their group (followers) by opening up channels of communication, providing socioemotional support, "psychological strokes," and facilitating behaviors (Hersey & Blanchard, 1988).

5. Style adaptability: The ability to alter style appropriately to adapt to varying readiness levels of followers in a specific situation (Hersey & Blanchard, 1988).

6. Style range: Style range refers to the total number of quadrants in Hersey's model in which respondents reported two or more responses.

7. Secondary style: A leader's secondary or supporting style(s) is a leadership style that person tends to use on occasion. A secondary style tends to be one's "back-up" style when one is not using her/his primary style.

8. Job maturity: A person's maturity to perform the job as influenced by education and experience (Hersey & Blanchard, 1988).

9. Psychological maturity: The person's level of motivation as reflected in achievement needs and willingness to accept responsibility (Hersey & Blanchard, 1988).

10. Community college: A publicly supported two year post-secondary educational institution accredited to award the associate in arts or science as its highest degree, previously called "Junior College," "Two-Year College," "City-College," "County College", or nicknamed "People's College" (Cohen & March, 1996).

11. Junior college: An educational institution offering a two-year course that is generally the equivalent to the first two years of a four year undergraduate course. In the 1970s, most of these institutions began calling themselves community colleges.

12. Transfer function: This term refers to one of the programs which community colleges provide for students who plan to obtain a baccalaureate degree after leaving the community college.

13. LEAD Self: Leader Effectiveness and Adaptability Description Self, an instrument that measures the self perception of individuals regarding their leadership styles.

14. Demographic Information Sheet: Demographic Information Sheet (DIS) was a survey questionnaire developed by the researcher with assistance from his dissertation advisor and committee members to gather information regarding a participant's personal/personnel and her/his institution's characteristics.

15. Location (Degree of urbanization): According to the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES, 1998), post-secondary institutions can be categorized into seven categories of urbanization. These categories are large city, mid-size city, urban fringe of large city, urban fringe of mid-size city, large town, small town, and rural.

Summary

Community college presidents are leaders, and strong presidents can and will make a difference in the future role of higher education in shaping society (Benezet, Katz, & Magnusson, 1981). Community college presidential leadership styles affect curriculum, organization, student services, the morale of the institution, and the mood of institution. Although the research on college leadership is voluminous, all of these

studies were conducted in certain regions of the country. This study analyzed community college presidential leadership styles across the nation and examined the relationship of community college presidential leadership styles and the organizational context.

This study was designed to develop a profile of community college presidents' leadership style. College presidents from 350 of 1,271 public two-year community colleges were randomly selected as the sample of the study. Descriptive statistics, one-way ANOVAs, chi-square tests, and Pearson product-moment correlations were used to analyze the data.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Chapter II is a review of the literature on leadership and the related organizational contexts. This review of related literature includes six parts: (a) the development of leadership theories, (b) the significance and role of community college presidents, (c) community college program priorities, (d) collective bargaining, (e) leader-follower relationship, and (f) a summary of the related literature.

Development of Leadership Theories

Research traditions in leadership, according to Bensimon et al. (1989), can be grouped into six categories. They are: (1) trait theories which focus on identifying specific personal characteristics that contribute to a person's ability to assume and successfully function in positions of leadership, (2) power and influence theories which consider leadership in terms of the source and amount of power available to leaders and the manner in which leaders exercise that power over followers through either unilateral or reciprocal interactions, (3) behavioral theories which study leadership by examining leaders' patterns of activity, managerial roles, and categories of behavior, (4) contingency theories which emphasize the importance of situational factors such as the nature of the task performed by a group or the nature of the external environment to understand

effective leadership, (5) cultural and symbolic theories which study the influence of leaders in maintaining or reinterpreting the system of shared beliefs and values that give meaning to organizational life, and (6) cognitive theories which suggest leadership is a social attribution that permits people to make sense of an equivocal, fluid, and complex world.

Since the beginning of this century, the topic of leadership has been the subject of extensive study. During this time, both researchers and practitioners have sought to analyze and define leadership. "Today there are almost as many different definitions of effective leadership as there are researchers who have studied the concept" (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 1991, p. 118). In 1981, Bass documented more than 3,000 empirical investigations which have examined leadership. Bennis and Nanus (1985), in their review of 1,000 studies, pointed out that the research has produced more than 350 definitions of effective leadership with no "clear and unequivocal understanding as to what distinguishes leaders from nonleaders, and perhaps more important, what distinguished effective leaders from ineffective leaders" (p. 4).

Rost (1993) collected 110 definitions of leadership in the 312 books, chapters, and articles he reviewed and grouped the definitions into identifiable conceptual frameworks. Topping the list of conceptual frameworks of leadership is one Rost called "do the leader's wishes." This framework of leadership definitions delivers the message that leadership is basically doing what the leader wants done. This concept of leadership is extremely popular with many of the authors who do not define leadership and with the

people in the media who used the word leadership in the 1980s. When Bass revised Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership in 1981, he said:

> For the purposes of this Handbook, leadership must be defined broadly. Leadership is an interaction between members of a group. Leaders are agents of change, persons whose acts affect other people more than other people's acts affect them.... Leadership occurs when one group member modifies the motivation or competencies of others in the group. (p. 16)

Misumi (1985) defined leadership as:

> Leadership is understood as the role behavior of a specific group member who, more than other members, exerts some kind of outstanding, lasting, and positive influence on fulfilling the group's functions of problem solving or goal achievement and group maintenance. (p. 8)

For Kellerman (1984), "Leadership is the process by which one individual consistently exerts more impact than others on the nature and direction of group activity" (p. 70). For Gardner (1986), "Leadership is the process of persuasion and example by which an individual (or team) induces a group to take action that is in accord with the leader's purposes or the shared purposes of all" (p. 6). For Sergiovanni (1989), "Leadership is the process of persuasion by which a leader or leadership group induce followers to act in a manner that enhances the leader's purposes or shared purposes" (p. 213).

The second in Rost's list of conceptual frameworks of leadership is "leadership as achieving group or organizational goals". This framework expresses the thought that "...leadership involves the process of influence between a leader and followers to attain group, organizational or societal goals" (Rost, 1993, p. 486). Jago (1982), in his review of literature, concluded that:

> Leadership is a process and a property. The process of leadership is the use of noncoercive influence to direct and coordinate the activities of the members of an organized group toward the accomplishment of group objectives. As a property, leadership is a set of qualities or characteristics attributed to those who are perceived to successfully employ such influence. (p. 315)

The third in Rost's list of frameworks of leadership is "leadership as management". The authors of this group hold that leadership is management, the exercise of authority. Among the authors, Dachler (1984) gave a similar idea of definition of leadership: "Leadership is defined as the design, change, and development of, and giving direction to social subsystems embedded in their environment" (p. 102). Another author in the same group, Hunt (1984), described "leadership is the use of personal-power bases (expert and referent) to influence group members. Leadership, then, is the use of position-power bases (reward, coercion, and legitimacy) to influence group members" (p. 21).

The fourth in Rost's list of conceptual frameworks of leadership is "leadership as influence". Leadership, according to Bryman (1986), "involves a social influence process in which a person steers members of the group towards a goal" (p. 2). Tucker (1981) explained that "Leadership is a process of human interaction in which some individuals exert, or attempt to exert, a determining influence upon others" (p. 11).

The fifth in Rost's list of conceptual frameworks of leadership is "leadership as traits". This group of scholars and practitioners propose that leaders are persons endowed with specific traits related to their effectiveness that differentiates them from followers. Traits may include (a) physical characteristics such as height, appearance, age, energy

level; (b) personality such as self-esteem, dominance, emotional stability, initiative, persistence; (c) social background such as education, socioeconomic status, and (d) ability such as general intelligence, verbal fluency, knowledge, originality, social insight, cognitive complexity. Research continued in this area with Bennis (1984) identifying four common traits in a group of leaders that he studied. Bennis' study suggested that the ability to communicate both in a sense of goal outcome and meaning are important characteristics. He also suggested that the ability to be trusted and to know one's own limitations are important leadership traits.

The sixth in Rost's list of conceptual frameworks of leadership is "leadership as transformation". Burns (1978) introduced the notion of transformational leadership as one of two forms that leadership can take, and he has become famous for initiating a movement to reconceptualize leadership as a transformational process. Transformational leadership goes beyond meeting the basic needs of subordinates. It engages followers in such a way as to raise them to new levels of morality and motivation. Leaders' and followers' purposes become fused under transformational leadership rather than separate but related.

The first studies on leadership were conducted in the 1900s. Two theorists recognized for their influence in this period are Fredrick W. Taylor and Henry Fayol. Their leadership style focused on the one-dimensional theory, solely concerned with getting the task accomplished (Taylor, 1947).

Based on a technological approach to management, Taylor developed scientific management. Taylor advocated that production was increased by the improvement of

methods used by workers. He suggested that managers should cooperate with workers, to ensure that all work being done was in accordance with the principles of the science that had been developed. Taylor also recognized a division of work between managers and workers. Managers assumed planning, organizing, and decision-making activities, whereas workers performed their jobs. His four principles of scientific management, (1) scientific job analysis, (2) selection of personnel, (3) management cooperation, and (4) functional supervision, were designed to maximize worker productivity. The leader's main concern was for the organization and production rather than the needs or job satisfaction of workers (Taylor, 1947).

Henry Fayol was an engineer and French industrialist. He served as managing director of a large coal-mining firm in France. He attributed his success as a manager not to any personal qualities he may have possessed, but to a set of management principles that he used. Fayol claimed that all managers perform five basic functions: (a) planning, (b) organizing, (c) commanding, (d) coordinating, and (e) controlling. He was the first to recognize management as a continuous process.

One of the most influential contributors to the one-dimensional theory was German sociologist Max Weber, who first described the concept of bureaucracy. Weber's concept of bureaucracy is based on a comprehensive set of rational guidelines. Those guidelines were believed to constitute an ideal structure for organizational effectiveness. Weber felt that the bureaucratic apparatus would be very impersonal. This would minimize irrational personal and emotional factors, leaving personnel free to work with a minimum of friction and confusion.

During the 1920s and 1930s, the two-dimensional theory evolved. Along with task orientation, human relationship became an important dimension for consideration in effective leadership. The Western Electric Company's Hawthorne plant in Chicago facilitated one of the most far-reaching series of experiments in the study of human behavior. The original experiment conducted by Elton Mayo was designed simply to determine the optimum level of illumination in a shop for maximum production efficiency of its workers.

The scientific management movement was outgrown by the human relations movement in the late 1920s and early 1930s. The human relations movement is considered to have started with a series of studies conducted at the Hawthorne Plant of Western Electric near Chicago by Elton Mayo and his associates. These studies are widely known as the Hawthorne studies. Researchers of the Hawthorne studies discovered that the improvement in productivity was due to such human—social factors as morale, a feeling of belongingness, and effective management in which such interpersonal skills as motivating, leading, participative decision making, and effective communications were used. Researchers later concluded, from the results of incentive pay-system experiments, that informal work groups emerged with their own norms for appropriate behavior of group members. The importance of understanding human behavior from the perspective of management was then firmly established.

In contrast to the scientific theory of management focusing on the organization, the human relations theory focused on the individual needs of the workers. The scientific

management theory was based on task or output, while the human relations theory was based on people and their relationships.

Chester Barnard (1938), president of the New Jersey Bell Telephone Company, was one of the first authors to take the behavioral science approach. His best-known idea was the cooperative system, an attempt to integrate, in a single framework, human relations and classical management principles. Barnard argued that the executive must meet two conditions if cooperation and financial success are to be achieved. First is effectiveness which is the degree to which the common purpose of the organization is achieved. Second is efficiency which is the satisfaction of "individual motives" of employees. His major point is that an organization can operate and survive only when both the organization's goals and the goals of the individuals working for it are kept in equilibrium. In his ideas, managers must have both human and technical skills.

Following the studies on management theory in the industrial world, an influential body of research begun in 1947 by the Bureau of Business Research at Ohio State University and known as the Ohio State Leadership studies, focused on identifying those leadership behaviors instrumental for the attainment of group and organizational goals. Researchers at Ohio State sought to find out the types of behavior leaders display and the effect these leader behaviors have on work-group performance and satisfaction. Researchers from the disciplines of psychology, sociology, and economics developed and used the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) to study leadership in different types of groups and situations (Stogdill & Coons, 1957). The objective of the Ohio State leadership studies was to identify the different dimensions of leader behavior

(Bensimon et al., 1989). Two essential aspects of leadership behavior were identified—initiating structure and consideration. Initiating structure was defined as the extent to which a leader organizes and specifies the way a job is to be done. Consideration, on the other hand, describes the extent to which a leader shows concern for the welfare of the workers.

The LBDQ was developed at Ohio State University to compile data to help determine leader behavior (Stogdill & Coons, 1957). The original LBDQ contained 15 items pertaining to consideration and an equal number for initiating structure. The instrument yielded a description of leader performance and how this performance was perceived by others. The categories of Initiating Structure and Consideration were measured by observed leader behavior that resulted in separate scores for each category.

Researchers at the University of Michigan's Institute for Social Research used an approach to identify leaders who were rated as either effective or ineffective and then studied the behavior of these leaders in an attempt to develop consistent patterns of behavior that differentiated effective from ineffective leaders. The Michigan studies identified two distinct leadership behaviors that were very similar to the initiating-structure and consideration dimensions, which evolved from the Ohio State studies. The two dimensions identified were production-centered leadership and employee-centered leadership. The production-centered leader emphasizes employee tasks and the methods used to accomplish them. The employee-centered leader emphasizes the employees' personal needs and the development of interpersonal relationships.

The idea that effective leadership behavior is "contingent" on the situation is more prevalent today than the idea of one best set of leader traits and the one best set of leader behaviors. Contingency leadership theory emerged in 1967. Fred Fiedler and his associates have spent two decades developing and refining a contingency theory of leadership (Fiedler, 1967). According to the contingency theory, the effectiveness of a leader in achieving high group performance is contingent on the leader's motivational system and the degree to which the leader controls and influences the situation. The three situational factors include leader-member relations, task structure, and the leader's position power. Fiedler developed a unique technique to measure leadership style. Measurement is obtained from scores on the least preferred co-worker (LPC) scale. A high score indicates that the leader views her least preferred co-worker in relatively favorable terms. A low score means that the least preferred co-worker is described in a very negative, rejecting manner. A high-LPC score indicates a relationship-motivated (employee-centered) leader whose interpersonal-relationship needs have first priority, and a low-LPC score indicates a task-motivated (production-centered) leader whose task-achievement needs have first priority.

The basic premise of Fiedler's (1967) contingency theory is that in some situations high-LPC (relationship-motivated) leaders will be more effective, whereas other circumstances make it more likely that low-LPC (task-motivated) leaders will be most effective. Therefore, Fiedler concluded that the relationship between leadership style and effectiveness depends on several factors in the situation. Three factors he identified are: (1) leader-member relations, which refer to the quality of the relationship

between the leader and the group, (2) task structure, which refers to the nature of the subordinate's task—whether it is routine or complex, and (3) position power, which refers to the extent to which the leader possesses the ability to influence the behavior of subordinates through legitimate, reward, and coercive powers. The general conclusion reached by Fiedler is that task-motivated leaders were most effective in extreme situations where the leader either had a great deal of influence or very little power and influence. Relationship-motivated leaders were most effective where the leader has moderate power and influence.

Another widely known contingency theory of leadership is the path-goal theory of leadership effectiveness developed by Robert J. House and Terence R. Mitchell. Path-goal theory suggests that effective leaders are those who clarify the paths to attaining goals and help subordinates overcome problems, thereby increasing subordinates' satisfaction and productivity (House, 1971). Essentially the path-goal theory attempts to explain the impact of leadership behavior on subordinate motivation, satisfaction, effort, and performance as moderated by situational factors of the subordinates and the work environment.

Victor Vroom and Phillip Yetten also accepted a contingency approach to leadership and developed the Vroom-Yetten Contingency Model. Their approach suggests that organizational effectiveness can be affected by leader behavior and that leader behavior can be affected by situational variables (Vroom & Yetton, 1973). A decision model developed by Vroom and Yetten enables leaders to follow a systematic approach to problem solving. They identify and describe five alternative decision-

making styles that can be placed on a continuum from highly autocratic to highly participatory. One leader can use all five styles depending on the situation. As a decision-maker, the leader may be autocratic in one situation and participatory in the next. For Vroom and Yetten's model, different types of situations require different types of styles. The key to effective administration is the ability to correctly diagnose the situation and then choose an appropriate decision-making style.

Tannenbaum and Schmidt (1973) elaborated on the styles identified in the earlier trait and behavioral studies of leadership. They conceived of a continuum that runs between boss-centered leadership at one extreme and subordinate-centered leadership at the other. Between these extremes are five points representing various combinations of managerial authority and subordinate freedom. From their model, Tannenbaum and Schmidt identified five typical patterns testing of leadership behavior: (1) telling, (2) selling, (3) testing, (4) consulting, and (5) joining. At the one end of the continuum, the authoritarian leader has a tendency to rely on position power in dealing with workers, while at the other end, the democratic leader is empowered by the group being led.

In 1964, Blake and Mouton published the "managerial grid" concept. They define two dimensions of leader orientation as concern for production and concern for people. These dimensions are similar to the task-oriented and employee-oriented concepts. The grid portrays five key leadership styles. The five leadership styles were defined as:

> 1. Impoverished – exertion of minimum effort to get required work done is appropriate to sustain organization membership.
> 2. Country Club – thoughtful attention to needs of people for satisfying relationship leads to a comfortable, friendly organizational atmosphere and work tempo.

> 3. Task – efficiency in operations results from arranging conditions to work in such a way that human elements interfere to a minimum degree.
> 4. Middle-of-the-Road – adequate organization performance is possible by balancing the necessity to get out work while maintaining morale of people at a satisfactory level.
> 5. Team – work accomplishment is from committed people; interdependence through a "common stake" in organizational purpose leads to relationships of trust and respect. (Blake & Mouton, 1985, p. 12)

Blake and Mouton have developed instruments which are designed to stimulate feedback from colleagues, associates, subordinates, and the like, which enable the targeted person to learn from others how they experience his or her leadership (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 1991). The Grid is used to help people analyze the different possibilities and likely results to be achieved by each of the Grid styles and select the one they believe most effective.

Reddin (1970) developed another useful model for identifying the leadership styles of practicing school administrators. By adding an effectiveness dimension to the task behavior and relationship behavior dimensions of the earlier Ohio State leadership models, Reddin attempted to integrate the concepts of leadership style with situational demands of a specific environment. According to Reddin, when the style of a leader is appropriate to a given situation, it is termed effective; when the style is inappropriate to a given situation, it is termed ineffective.

Recognized as major contributors to tri-dimensional theories and models are William J. Reddin, Paul Hersey, and Kenneth H. Blanchard. William J. Reddin's 3-D Management Style Theory added the "effectiveness" dimension (Reddin, 1967). Paul

Hersey and Kenneth H. Blanchard added the " readiness" dimension (Hersey & Blanchard, 1988). Both models emphasize that the effectiveness of leaders depends on how their leadership style interrelates with the situation in which they operate.

Hersey and Blanchard's situational leadership theory is an extension of Tannenbaum and Schmidt's leadership-style continuum, Blake and Mouton's managerial grid, and Reddin's three-dimensional leadership styles. Their model uses task behavior and relationship behavior in the same way as Initiating Structure and Consideration behavior are used in the Ohio State studies. Hersey and Blanchard defined task and relationship behaviors that are central to the concept of leadership style as follows:

> Task behavior – The extent to which leaders are likely to organize and define the roles of the members of their group (followers); to explain what activities each is to do and when, where, and how tasks are to be accomplished; characterized by endeavoring to establish well-defined patterns of organization, channels of communication, and ways of getting jobs accomplished.
>
> Relationship behavior – The extent to which leaders are likely to maintain personal relationships between themselves and members of their group (followers) by opening up channels of communication, providing socioemotional support, "psychological strokes", and facilitating behaviors. (Hersey & Blanchard, 1988, pp. 116-117)

According to Situational Leadership, there is no best way to influence people. The key for leadership effectiveness in Hersey and Blanchard's model is to match the situation with the appropriate leadership style. Four basic leadership styles are in the model:

- Style 1 (Telling) has the highest probability of success when the followers are low in ability and willingness and need direction.

- Style 2 (Selling) maximizes success with followers who are still unable but they are trying.

- Style 3 (Participating) is used with followers that are able but they have just developed this ability and have not had an opportunity to gain confidence in doing it on their own.

- Style 4 (Delegating) is used where the followers are both ready and willing. They have had enough opportunity to practice and feel comfortable without the leader providing direction.

The research by Hersey and Blanchard (1988) led to the development of the Leader Effectiveness and Adaptability Description Self and Other (LEAD-Self and Other) instruments. This study used LEAD-Self for community college presidents to identify their own leadership styles. The LEAD-Self was designed to measure self-perception of three aspects of leader behavior: (1) primary style, (2) style range, and (3) style adaptability. Primary style refers to one of the four styles that one would tend to use most frequently. Style range refers to the total number of Hersey's quadrants in which there are two or more responses. Style range provides a respondent a sense for how flexible she/he is in varying the types of behaviors she/he engages in when attempting to influence others. Style adaptability is the degree to which one is able to vary one's style appropriately to the readiness level of a follower in a specific situation.

Additional contributors to the human relations aspect of leadership in the 1950s and 1960s were theorists such as Maslow, McGregor, Argyris, and Likert. Maslow's (1954) theory suggests that an administrator's job is to provide avenues for the satisfaction of employee's needs that also support organizational goals and to remove impediments that block need-satisfaction and cause frustration, negative attitudes, or

dysfunctional behavior. According to Maslow, the driving force that causes people to work in an organization, stay in it, and achieve its goals, is a hierarchy of needs. As the lowest order of needs in the hierarchy is satisfied, a higher-order need appears. These needs occur in the following order: (1) physical, (2) safety, (3) social, (4) esteem, and (5) self-actualization (Maslow, 1954).

McGregor (1960) presented a convincing argument that most managerial actions flow directly from the assumptions managers hold about their subordinates. McGregor referred to the two contrasting sets of assumptions as Theory X and Theory Y. Theory X assumes that most people prefer to be directed and are not interested in assuming responsibility. Managers who accept this assumption attempt to structure, control, and closely supervise their employees. McGregor considers Theory X to be incompatible with democratic leaders because it conflicts with individual need-fulfillment on the job.

McGregor developed Theory Y because people's behavior in modern organizations more nearly matches its set of assumptions. The major principle of this theory is that work is natural and commitment to objectives is a function of rewards for achievement. Therefore, under proper conditions, people accept and seek responsibility. If properly motivated, people can be basically self-directed and creative at work. Theory Y has gradually become accepted as a leading style and behavior of management and leadership.

Building upon McGregor's theory, Argyris (1957) conducted extensive studies on the importance of the relationship of people and the formal structure of organizations. He emphasized the need for a leader to focus on the participative style of leadership. He

proposed that the human personality progresses along an immaturity-maturity continuum—from immaturity as an infant to maturity as an adult. Argyris believed that a more participatory management structure can result in the growth and development of human personality and hence eliminate the incongruency between the individual and the organization.

In 1961, Likert introduced his theory on leadership. Likert conducted extensive empirical research at the Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan to examine the effect of management systems on employees' attitudes and behavior. He discovered that the most successful leaders were employee relationship-oriented. These leaders were described as being employee-centered. The leaders who were task-oriented or job-centered were found to be less successful. Based on many years of research conducted in various organizational settings—industrial, government, health-care, and educational—Likert proposed four basic systems of organization. These four systems—System 1 (exploitive-authoritarian), System 2 (benevolent authoritarian), System 3 (consultative), and System 4 (participative) represent four different leadership styles. Leadership styles on the continuum ranged from authoritarian in System 1 as an extreme to democratic in System 4 as the other extreme (Likert, 1967).

One of the theories on leaderhip is transactional and transformational leadership. Burns (1978) viewed transactional leadership as a relationship between leaders and followers based on an exchange of valued things, which could be economic, political, or psychological in nature. From this perspective, leaders and followers are seen as involved in a bargaining process rather than in a relationship with an enduring purpose.

Leaders' and followers' purposes become separate under transactional leadership. The monitors of transactional leadership are model values like honesty, fairness, and honoring commitments (Bensimon et al., 1989). Transformational leadership goes beyond meeting the basic needs of subordinates. It engages followers as to raise them to new levels of morality and motivation. Leaders' and followers' purposes become fused and related under transformational leadership. Transforming leaders are concerned with end values such as liberty, justice, or equality.

According to Bass (1985), while the transactional leader accepts the organizational culture as it exists, the transformational leader invents, introduces, and advances new cultural forms. Three factors associated with transformational leadership are charismatic leadership, individual consideration, and intellectual stimulation.

> [Transformational leadership creates] performance beyond expectation [and] induces additional effort by sharply increasing subordinate confidence and by elevating the value of outcomes for the subordinate. This is done by expanding the subordinate's needs, by focusing on transcendental interests, and/or by altering or widening the subordinate's level of needs on Maslow's hierarchy. (Bass 1985, p. 22)

Such leadership is more likely to emerge in times of rapid change and distress and in organizations that have unclear goals and structure, well-educated members, and a high level of trust. Transformational leadership may be made possible only in rare circumstances by rare individuals, nevertheless, it has captured the interest of organizational scholars.

Community College Presidency

In the 1970s, community college presidents were described as the "Man of the Middle" (Vaughan, 1986). The presidents during this period were confronted with sorting out the dilemmas of the past two decades, which included lower numbers of 18-to-22-year-olds, declining dollars, and lessening public support (Vaughan, 1986). Bound by these Gordian knots, 'The Man in the Middle' needed an expanding repertoire of talents and skills to maintain initiatives within and on behalf of this institution (Vaughan, 1986). These "men in the middle" saw the role of the community college president in 1970s as a manipulator, an educational leader, a marketer, a money manager, and a politician.

According to an article in the Community and Junior College Journal (October, 1980), community college presidents recognized that they could not be all things to all people—"not if he or she wants to maintain sanity and avoid serious conflicts" (Wenrich, 1980, p. 37). The most important role of the community college presidents, according to Wenrich, is to maintain institutional integrity through his or her own ethical behavior. Parnell (1980) also claimed that "the community college president has no more important task than that of continuously clarifying and emphasizing the mission of the community college" (p. 44).. Rushing (1976) discussed the changing role of the community college president. He claimed that the president may expect "intensified pressures in finance, governance, public confidence, the employee's search for security, and governmental control" (p. 1). He discussed the president's role in relationship to the economy, public

attitudes, collective bargaining, and government relations. However, the most important role assigned to the community college presidents is that of leader.

Once again, from the 1980s to the 1990s, the role of community college presidency has changed. Limited financial resources, changes in enrollment, diversity in student demographics, calls for accountability, and collective bargaining have signaled a profound change in the role of the community college president. The greatest change during the past 20 years is that the decision-making process, once exclusively the domain of the president, has evolved into a more democratic, participatory process. Trustees, students, and especially faculty have begun participating in decision-making. Shared authority and increasing government regulation mean that the president must now deal with state legislatures, finance committees, coordinating boards, and even local constituencies. The president's role has become increasingly political. The community college president is still very much a leader but a different kind of leader.

Researchers have concluded that effective presidents, far from being autonomous and rigid decision-makers, are flexible, thoughtful, and strong visionaries. Collective bargaining is perhaps the most significant issue to affect community college leadership in the past 20 years, and the literature on this subject has been almost unanimously negative (Lewis, 1989). Claims have been made that unionism weakens administrative control, and that collective bargaining creates competition rather than cooperation between faculty and administrators. On the other hand, it is noted that a collective bargaining contract, which outlines the duties and responsibilities of faculty, can make faculty more accountable. Since it is unlikely that faculty will yield its newfound role in governance,

community college presidents must adapt to their new role as managers of the decision-making process (Lewis, 1989).

According to the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (AACJC, 1987), over 650 public two-year institutions were founded from 1957 to 1977. After World War II, President Truman's report entitled Higher Education for American Democracy, examined higher education "in light of the social role it has to play" and encouraged higher education to be "better adapted to contemporary needs" (Sansing, 1990). Affected by Truman's report, enrollment in community colleges grew from 776,493 in 1957 to almost 4 million in 1977. During this period, community college presidents came from backgrounds as varied as the colleges they led. The founding presidents were active individuals with little time for reflection. Every minute of their every day was devoted to building colleges and selling their mission to legislators, the faculty, and the public, often simultaneously (Vaughan, 1989). Community college presidents at the earlier period knew that the community college was democracy's answer to the call for universal higher education, to opening the door of opportunity to everyone. Their role at that point was to increase enrollments, make the campuses grow, and win the applause of the public. For their focus, Vaughan stated:

> They focused on a vision born of faith, shaped in the present, and grounded in the belief that higher education was the main avenue for curing many of society's ills, including poverty and its progeny, ignorance. The centerpiece of their vision was the open-access, comprehensive public community college. (p. 2)

Many early community college presidents sensed that the moment was right for taking higher education to the masses. Most early community college presidents realized that their job was to provide colleges that were accessible to almost everyone.

The college presidency has changed today because the president's authority had been challenged by most of his constituents including students, faculty, and various state and local political officers. The contributors to the changing role of the president pointed out by Mayhew (1971) are: (a) the delocalization of presidential interests, (b) the creation of supra-institutional boards of control, (c) the reduction of internal control and power, and (d) the loss of legitimacy.

The degree of complexity in an organization can be measured in a variety of ways (Lilly, 1978). Baldridge, Curtis, Ecker, & Riley (1978) made the point that colleges and universities are complex organizations but they go further saying that there are also additional complexities in academic organizations—goal ambiguity, client-centeredness, and high degree of professionalism—which exacerbate the problems. Regardless of how it is measured, community colleges have indeed become complex organizations like their four-year counterparts, and with this complexity has come a reduction in the power of the presidency.

Furthermore, several external and internal constraints and pressures have been identified that reduce the degree of freedom within which college presidents exercise leadership. These constraints include reduced confidence in leadership and respect for authority, reduced institutional growth resulting from demographic changes in the student body and declining resources, intrusion of external groups, such as the media and

government, the need to contend with system bureaucracies, faculty unions, and intrusive boards of trustees, and the presence of friends, colleagues, and associates who can turn as easily into fatal opponents (Kerr & Gade, 1986).

Although today's community college presidents still subscribe to the vision of the community college developed during the 1960s and 1970s, the presidents' role in achieving this vision is less clear than the role of the founding presidents. Based upon a large number of interviews with presidents and trustees, extensive reading related to the college and university presidency and his own observations, Vaughan (1989) has concluded that three major functions should provide the focus for today's community college presidents: (1) managing the institution, (2) creating the campus climate, and (3) interpreting and communicating the institution's mission.

Vaughan made a clear distinction between educational leadership and academic leadership. To be the institution's educational leader, the president must offer solutions to problems and issues that are compatible with the college's mission and that gain understanding and support from members of the college community and the community at large. The distinguishing characteristic of the president as the leader of an academic institution ought to be a devotion to and appreciation of scholarship, including the encouragement of scholarly activities by himself or herself and by others. Community college presidents have a greater obligation to see that the college responds to local educational needs than their four-year counterparts. The ability of community college presidents to influence the educational process is enhanced by the flexibility of the

community colleges and by a more centralized approach to curriculum development than often exists in four-year colleges and universities.

Dodds (1962) concluded in his book, The Academic President: Educator or Caretaker?, that the president must not only preserve his educational leadership role but must also enhance the role, that the president must participate actively in framing and carrying out the teaching and scholarly activities of the institution. The president as educational leader interprets and communicates the college's entire needs to its constituents (Kerr, 1972). These needs include the need for continuing and increased funding for faculty, staff, supplies, equipment, and buildings, the need for expanded programs and services, the need for eliminating programs and positions, and also the need for ensuring that the community college is an integral part of the educational fabric of the community, the state, and the nation.

The most important issue facing American higher education, according to Stadtman's (1980) study, is financing higher education. The other most frequently mentioned are: redefining the goals of higher education, maintaining enrollments, maintaining autonomy, strengthening career education, public confidence in higher education, and continuing education. Each area will require the attention of most college presidents in the coming new era.

McClenney (1978) suggested that a community college president who is presently in touch with reality has been confronted with concerns about accountability, steady state conditions, retrenchment, consumerism, competition, loss of autonomy, government regulations, collective bargaining, attacks on traditional accreditation, court decisions,

energy conservation, affirmative action, higher education spending, and faculty pessimism. The response to these realities has been to become "management conscious" (Lilly, 1987). For McClenney, strong management capabilities are what a president needs to handle the heavy responsibilities.

Bickford (1978) concluded that the president's interaction with the college publics, ranging from those internal to the institution (faculty, students) to those external to the institution (business community, media, agencies), as the central focus of the job because they will be the sources of financial support for the institution. He therefore suggested that the president's primary function is that of marketer.

For Wygal (1978), the future role of the president is that of manipulator. He contends that much of the power of the college president is mythical and that his primary role must be that of manipulator. The president must work through others to attain institutional goals by involving them in decision-making as well as mobilizing them in support of the institution.

If community colleges are to raise standards, status, and improve the overall campus environment, advanced and improved leadership practices for higher education leaders are needed in the 21st century. In their article, "21st Century Leadership Practices Needed for Higher Education," Eddy, Murphy, Spaulding, & Chandras (1997) suggested areas in which new leadership practices will be necessary. The new leadership, according to Eddy et al., must take new directions in ethics, collaboration, accountability, privatization, international and distance education, volunteerism, and multiculturalism.

Benezet et al. (1981) dealt almost exclusively with the role of the president as leader in their Style and Substance: Leadership and the College Presidency. The authors conducted interviews with presidents, senior administrators, faculty, and students at 25 colleges and universities, with the express purpose being to explore the dynamics of the college presidency. The first conclusion reached by the authors is that presidents do make a difference. The authors also concluded that in addition to being a good leader, the president must also be a good manager. The authors concluded that presidents, whether they wish it or not, are leaders, and that strong presidents can and will make a difference in the future role of higher education in shaping society.

Fisher and Tack (1990) examined the need for effective presidents to mold the mission of the institution into a cause for those they lead. Communication between the presidents of institutions and all involved parties was deemed important when implementing any process of change (Riggs & Akor, 1992). The president of an institution of higher education must be perceived as communicating effectively with her/his staff and faculty and allowing them control and participation in school management.

There has been much written about the leadership role of today's college presidents, however, there remains a lack of consensus about the distinctiveness of leadership styles of community college presidents. Nevertheless, the effectiveness of the institution and the viability of its programs are projected by the leadership of its president.

Because of the changing roles of college presidents (Bresler, 1996), there appears to be a great need for continued studies relating to the factors contributing to their leadership styles and their impact upon their institutions' environments, particularly as related to educational excellence. Several research studies (Eddy et al., 1997; Gardener, 1986; Lockwood, 1997; Nanus, 1992; Rost, 1993; Sergiovanni, 1992, 1996; Terry, 1993) have shown that many different styles of leadership are used by today's leaders. These styles range from autocratic to democratic. For the past two decades, the topic of college presidents' leadership styles and the relationship of leadership styles and variables like stress, burnout, and gender of college presidents has been the focus of many studies (Bennett, 1987; Crawford, 1992; Gubanich, 1991; Riley, 1990; Thomas, 1993).

Among these studies, Riley (1990) investigated the leadership styles of 24 small, private liberal arts college presidents in North Carolina and found that small, private liberal arts college presidents like those in most types of educational institutions employ a variety of leadership styles. However, their styles are more interactive when conditions are favorable and tend to be more analytical and self-reliant when conditions are unfavorable. Based on his analysis, Riley also found that the most frequently employed leadership style is one that signifies a desire for inclusion in a team effort and the flexibility to meet any contingency that may arise.

Crawford (1992) examined the self-perceived leadership style held both by urban community college and corporate presidents. He concluded that length of tenure as president does not influence the leadership styles of presidents. However, he found that there is a relationship between community college presidents' leadership styles and the

length of their working experience in higher education. That is, the longer community college presidents have worked in higher education the more their leadership style is characterized by consideration.

Community colleges in rural areas have different needs than urban ones. As pointed out by Lovell and Miller (1998), rural community colleges have the potential to greatly improve the quality of life in southern rural life. They also contend that the majority of the rural public community colleges across the nation have been ignored and under funded. Leaders of these institutions, under the demands associated with cost-effective accountability, may have to exert leadership power that is possibly different from that required by their urban counterparts in order to accomplish the same set of specific goals.

Thomas (1993), in his study to determine whether gender affects the acceptance of a community college president, found that there is a difference in expectations of male and female presidents when they are first appointed. He also found that women presidents were more likely to have a participatory style, but the most successful presidents had an approach to leadership that blended traits traditionally attributed to males with those traditionally attributed to females. He concluded that although stereotyping of female leaders persists, it is the individual's personality and the type of training he/she received that determines the style he/she will practice once in a position of leadership.

Gubanich (1991) examined the relationship between leadership style and job burnout among college and university presidents belonging to the Northwest Association

of Schools and Colleges. Using the Leader Effectiveness and Adaptability Description (LEAD) Self instrument, four leadership style categories (Telling, Selling, Participating, and Delegating) were possible. Based on her analysis, Gubanich found that the presidents fell into two of the four categories: Selling and Participating leadership styles. Being congruent with Crawford's (1992) study, she also found that presidents with more years in administration tended to use the Selling style more frequently, and presidents of larger institutions were more likely to employ a Selling style and less likely to employ a Participating style than presidents of smaller schools. Bennett (1987) conducted a study to investigate presidents' self-perceptions of their leadership styles as contrasted with perceptions of their leadership styles that were held by their administrative council member in five southeastern states. He found that the majority of the presidents perceived their primary style to be Participating and the secondary leadership style to be Selling. The results of his study indicated that younger and less experienced administrators tended to perceive the presidents' leadership styles, effectiveness and flexibility similar to the way the presidents themselves perceived their leadership styles.

In his 1986 book, The Community College Presidency, Vaughan reported results of his efforts to survey seventy-five leading community college presidents regarding "personal attributes, skills, and abilities required of the successful president" (p. 185). Vaughan found that the presidents identified as national leaders rated integrity and judgment as the attributes of most importance; with courage, concern and flexibility rated as highly important. In the area of presidents' skills and abilities, the presidents identified as leaders named "produce results" as the skill of highest importance. Skills

and abilities identified as extremely important included "select people" and "resolve conflicts" (Vaughan, 1986).

McFarlin and Ebbers (1998) conducted a study to determine the relationship between selected preparation factors and the existence of outstanding leadership skills among community college presidents. They used a peer rating method to divide the respondents into an outstanding/leading group and a normative group. They found that presidents in the outstanding/leading group had assumed their first presidency at a slightly younger age than the respondents in the normative group. The outstanding/leading presidents had served as community college presidents slightly longer than their normative counterparts (10.9 years versus 9.1 years). They concluded by developing a composite of an outstanding/leading community college president. A community college president is a married White male, about 54 years old, has served as a community college president for 11 years and has been at his current institution for 9 years. He achieved his first community college presidency at 43 years of age. He leads a comprehensive community college of about 7, 200 students (4,000 FTE) located in the Upper Midwest. He holds a Ph.D. with a major in Higher Education/Community College Leadership.

Each person interprets educational issues on the basis of experience and role. According to McCabe (1988), former president of Miami-Dade Community College in Miami, the president is the only person in the college whose view is not constrained by role. The president must be the person who interprets the institution's mission and program in the context of current social needs. As a president, his/her most important

responsibility is to see that the institution's mission is accomplished and his/her commitment to the institution as an educational leader is fulfilled. The role of president in an urban community college has changed significantly during the past 25 years. Specifically, today the urban president's attention is being focused either outside the institution or on operational concerns, and the result is that educational issues are often left to others (McCabe, 1988). Thus, the leadership style of urban presidents is seen as different from that of small rural college presidents. Furthermore, different institutions have various missions, some of which focus on Liberal Arts/Transfer Credits, while others focus on Vocational Training/Technical Skills Preparation. Presidents are, therefore, thought, in fact, to employ different leadership styles in different institutional settings due to different missions (Fisher & Tack, 1990).

College Program Priority

The community college is defined as any institution accredited to award the associate in arts or science as its highest degree. There are 1,271 publicly supported community colleges in the United States. Most offer a comprehensive curriculum, however, the priority of the programs might vary among institutions according to their different missions. On the whole, a comprehensive curriculum includes the following programs:

- Transfer/Liberal Arts programs designed for students who plan to obtain a baccalaureate degree—these programs lead to an associate degree in science or the arts.
- Vocational/Occupational programs leading to a certificate or an associate degree in applied science.

- Community education and personal interest courses which do not award academic credit.
- Development/Remedial programs designed to prepare students to enter degree or certificate programs by improving their communication or mathematical skills.
- Community services—programs designed to serve the needs of the local community.
- Workforce development—programs designed to develop students' professional knowledge and working skills for the future workforce.

Among the 1,271 public community colleges, their mission priorities vary from institution to institution. Many of them emphasize one or two programs, and many more than two programs.

Collective Bargaining

Collective bargaining is a process developed in the United States. It is unique to this society and similar Western democracies. It is a new tool, and one which American employees are still learning to use. The basic concept is that employees should be granted rights to organize and to be represented by agents of their choice in determining the basic conditions of their employment. "This concept was first applied to industry in interstate commerce. During the past two decades, collective bargaining, or collective negotiations, as it is frequently called in education, has been extended more and more to public employment, including public schools and colleges" (Walter, 1975, p. 21).

Although collective bargaining in the public sector is a recent phenomenon, its development in higher education has been dramatic. The pattern of collective bargaining in higher education has developed in geographic sections of the country similar to the development in the private industrial sector and has developed most fully in community colleges (Borland & Birmingham, 1980). In the 70s and early 80s, the majority of

colleges and universities did not have collective bargaining. Few colleges in the South and West have bargaining agreements because they are located in "right-to-work" states. According to Borland and Birmingham, "right-to-work" laws presumably are to protect the rights of private sector employees. However, "the general perception of union leadership is that "right-to-work" statutes were intended to diminish the labor movement by prohibiting union security clauses in collective bargaining agreements" (Borland & Birmingham, 1980, p. 173).

Collective bargaining is one of the most significant issues to affect community college leadership in the past 20 years (Rushing, 1976). As Baldridge et al. (1978) stated, "Unionism can weaken the administrative dominance of many two-year institutions, and those administrators can expect major changes" (p. 156). Collective bargaining assumes that faculty and administrators are competitors rather than colleagues. It also forces the president to have a clearly defined role, therefore restricting some of the flexibility presidents traditionally enjoyed (Rushing, 1976). Community college faculty are not likely to give up their role in institutional governance, nor will they vote to do away with collective bargaining where it exists.

Leader-Follower Relationship

Leadership is seen as an interactive process that involves the leader and followers. It is not something just the leader possesses. Generally, leadership requires leaders to be major directive agents, but not exclusively so. Leaders are supposed to have a greater grasp of the vision of their institution's mission and share that with followers to some

degree (Hollander, 1987). The degree of confidence, trust, and respect followers have in the leader assesses the quality of the relationship between them.

The relationship between leaders and followers varies according to whether the organization or group is in a period of calm or crisis, in prosperity or recession, on a steep growth curve or stagnating. Gardner (1986) suggested some of the key features of this relationship.

> Leaders are almost never as much in charge as they are pictured to be, followers almost never as submissive as one might imagine. Influence and pressure flow both ways.... One generalization that is supported both by research and experience is that effective two-way communication is essential to proper functioning of the leader-follower relationship. (p. 61)

Truly gifted leaders know not only what followers need but what they fear, what they long to be, and what they like best about themselves. Leaders develop their styles as they interact with their followers. They must not only forge bonds of trust between themselves and their followers, they must create a climate of trust throughout the system over which they preside. Trust is not the only glue that holds a human group together, but when it dissolves, the capacity of the group to function effectively is seriously impaired.

For Hersey and Blanchard, the Situational Leadership Model also has its basis related to leader-follower relationship. Their model is based on an interplay among (a) task behavior (the amount of direction a leader gives); (b) relationship behavior (the amount of socioemotional support a leader provides; and (c) the maturity level that followers exhibit on a specific task, function, activity or objective that the leader is attempting to accomplish through the individual or group. For leaders to be effective,

Hersey and Blanchard indicate that leadership style must match the readiness or maturity level of followers. Readiness in Situational Leadership is defined as the extent to which a follower has the ability and willingness to accomplish a specific task. In the community college setting, presidents work as leaders of the institution and their immediate working administrators or faculty members work as followers.

Summary

The literature review of leadership revealed that leadership has generated a great number of studies and yet no consensus regarding the role of leadership presently exists. The role of community college presidents is also complex. To lead effectively, the president must be flexible and willing to listen. What Bensimon et al. (1989) concluded in their study may sum up this thought:

> Leaders are seen in roles ranging from all powerful hero to illusion and symbol. Leaders are described in terms of who they are, what they do, how they think, their presumed effects, and how they are seen by others. They are considered as heads of bureaucratic organizations, peer groups, political structures, and systems of myth and metaphor. A research agenda for leadership in higher education must recognize that leadership, as is the case with other social constructs, is multidimensional and that its definition and interpretation will legitimately differ among different observers with different values whose assessments may be based on conflicting criteria, units of measurement, or time horizons. (p. 80)

CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to develop a profile of community college presidents' leadership styles and to examine possible relationships between their perceived leadership styles and the organizational characteristics of their institutions. This chapter outlines the methods and procedures used in the study. More specifically, in this chapter the research design, instrumentation, population, data collection procedures, data analysis procedures, limitations, and research questions used to guide the study are discussed. The respondents were the presidents or chief executive officers who led the institutions included in the study. Descriptive statistics, one-way analyses of variance (ANOVA), chi-square tests, and Pearson product-moment correlations were used to analyze the data.

Research Questions

This research study developed a profile of community college presidents' self-perceived leadership styles and examined the relationships between perceived leadership styles and a number of variables that help describe organizational contexts

of their institutions. The following research questions served as the basis for conducting the study.

1. What is the profile of community college presidential leadership styles across the nation as perceived by the presidents themselves in response to the Leader Effectiveness and Adaptability Description (LEAD) Self?

2. Are there any significant relationships between the self-perceived leadership styles of community college presidents and the organizational contexts existent at their institutions, where organizational context is operationally defined by the following two sets of variables:

(a) Institutional Characteristics
    (1) Number of full time faculty
    (2) Single or multi-campus
    (3) Degree of urbanization
    (4) Geographical region
    (5) Approximate annual budget for Liberal Arts/College Transfer, Vocational/Occupational Training, and Non-Credit/Workforce Development
    (6) Whether or not there is collective bargaining agreement in place
    (7) Student enrollment
(b) Personal/Personnel Characteristics
    (1) Number of years at present position
    (2) Total number years of experience as a college administrator
    (3) Decision making style reported on DIS
    (4) Personal influence on organizational culture
    (5) Personal influence on external community
    (6) Perceived friendliness of work group
    (7) Perceived helpfulness of work group in getting the job done
    (8) Trust in the group

Research Design

The research design used in this study was the descriptive research design. The profile of community college presidents' leadership styles developed as part of the study was used to describe both the leadership styles that community college presidents used most frequently and the relationships between their leadership styles and the organizational contexts at their respective institutions.

Descriptive research, according to Gay (1996), involves collecting data in order to test hypotheses or answer questions concerning the current status of the subject of the study. A descriptive study is appropriate for determining and reporting the way things are. Although descriptive research sounds very simple, there is considerably more to it than just asking questions and reporting answers. Since one is generally asking questions that have not been asked before, instruments usually have to be developed for specific studies. Instrument development requires time and skill. Gay also emphasized that the major problem further complicating descriptive research is lack of response—failure of participants to return questionnaires. Another problem is that the issue of a cause-effect relationship cannot be addressed using a descriptive research design.

Instrumentation

Each participating president received a packet that contained a demographic questionnaire (DIS) and a Leader Effectiveness and Adaptability Description Self (LEAD-Self) questionnaire. The demographic questionnaire included 13 items asking presidents or campus CEOs questions about themselves and about their institutions. This

questionnaire was used to gather information about the relevant variables used to operationally define organizational context and determine its possible relation to leadership style. It included the specific institutional characteristics and personal/ personnel characteristics mentioned earlier.

The LEAD-Self (Hersey & Blanchard,1974), one of the two subtests of Leader Effectiveness and Adaptability Description, is based on Hersey and Blanchard's Situational Leadership Theory. The LEAD-Self was designed to measure self-perception of leader behavior. Hersey and Blanchard identified four basic leader behavior styles, as mentioned earlier, based on the equally important variables of task (i.e., telling when, where, what, and how to do something) and relationships, (i.e., providing socio-emotional support along with psychological strokes and facilitating behaviors). The four basic leadership styles according to their theory are (a) S1—High Task/Low Relationship (telling), (b) S2—High Task/High Relationship (selling), (c) S3—High Relationship/Low Task (participating), and (d) S4—Low Relationship/Low Task (delegating).

The LEAD-Self contains 12 leadership situations in which respondents are asked to select one of four actions that represent the behavior they think is appropriate and feel would most closely describe their own behavior in that type of situation. Each of the 12 questions has four possible answers that describe the four possible leadership styles. The LEAD-Self was designed to measure self-perception of four aspects of leader behavior: (1) primary style, (2) secondary style, (3) style range, and (4) style adaptability.

Validity and Reliability—LEAD-Self

Hersey and Joseph used the responses of 264 managers, ranging in age from 21 to 64, to standardize the LEAD-Self (Mitchell, 1985). The managers represented a variety of managerial levels. The concurrent validity coefficients of the 12 items ranged from .11 to .52. In another study, a significant correlation of .67 was found between the adaptability scores of the managers and the independent ratings of their supervisors (Mitchell, 1985). Item analysis data and reliability data were also collected on the sample of 264 managers. Each response option met the operationally defined criterion of less than 80% with respect to selection frequency.

In Zedeck's review of the LEAD-Self instrument (Mitchell, 1985), he noted that the LEAD-Self form contains a set of 12 leader-follower interactions to which the respondent indicates which one of four action choices should be taken in response to the situation. In Zedeck's review of the LEAD-Self, leadership style (i.e., identification as one of four types as indicated in the theory) and style adaptability scores (i.e., which is a measure of effectiveness) are derived, but there is no discussion of what constitutes right answers, why certain weightings are assigned in calculating the adaptability scores, or most importantly, what to do with the results (Mitchell, 1985). In previous studies, however, reliability and validity for the LEAD-Self have been established. Green (1980), in an executive summary of the LEAD instrument, found a correlation of .67 between the adaptability scores of managers and the independent ratings of their supervisors. Based on these findings, he deemed the instrument to be empirically sound. Green also found the instrument's stability to be moderately strong. In two administrations of the

instrument over a 6-week interval, 75% of the managers rated maintained their dominant leadership style, and 71% maintained their alternative style. He found the contingency coefficients to be .71 and the correlation for adaptability scores to be .61. Green argued that the instrument's scores remained stable across time, with the user being able to rely upon the results as consistent measures. Walter, Caldwell, and Marshall (1980) established two measures of internal consistency that yielded reliability coefficients of 0.81 and 0.61 for the other subset LEAD-Other. Their findings also provided support for the use of different leadership styles by administrators.

Population

The subjects in this study were public two-year community college presidents or campus CEOs whose institutions offer associate degrees. The population consisted of community college presidents or campus CEOs employed during the 1997-1998 academic year across the 48 contiguous states and the states of Hawaii and Alaska. All regions of the nation were included in the study. Out of the population of 1,271 presidents/CEOs, the sample of 350 (28%) was determined using a computer-based random selection process. This sample size, according to Gay (1996), is sufficient for the study.

The sample of 350 was selected from the list of community colleges compiled by the National Center for Education Statistics (1998, April) and downloaded from the Internet (http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/ic.html). The file contains detailed information about each postsecondary institution listed. The file contains data for a universe of 2,854 four-

year and higher institutions; 2,875 two-year institutions; and 4,272 less-than-two-year institutions located in the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the outlying areas. After engaging in a series of sorts, a list of institutions' names, presidents' or CEOs' names, addresses, types of control, levels of awards offered, and control affiliation for the population of 1,271 two-year publicly accredited community colleges was obtained. Out of this list, the sample was randomly generated using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS).

Procedure

The primary data gathering method employed in the study was the mailed questionnaire. The main advantages of the mail survey method, as noted by Oppenheim (1992), are low cost, lack of interview bias, and the ability to include a large population. However, several disadvantages of this method of data gathering are low return rates, no control over the answering of questions, no researcher-respondent feedback, and incomplete responses and questionnaires. One other disadvantage of the mailed questionnaire method is that reminder letters can be sent out after an initial waiting period, but this is no guarantee that response rates will be greatly enhanced (Fowler, 1988).

Before the letters of request and survey packets were mailed to the participants, the Institutional Review Board (IRB) form was completed and permission was granted to conduct the study. A copy of this form is found in Appendix A. Also permission to use the Leader Effectiveness and Adaptability Description Self (LEAD-Self) to identify

leadership styles was obtained from the Center for Leadership Studies, Inc. (see Appendix B). The demographic survey questionnaire (DIS) was developed by the researcher with assistance from his dissertation advisor and committee members (see Appendix C).

Once the random sample was computer generated using SPSS, each participant was mailed a packet that included a letter (found in Appendix D) stating the purpose of the study and requesting participation, the LEAD-Self questionnaire, a demographic survey (DIS), and a stamped return envelope. After a two-week period, follow-up letters (found in Appendix E) were sent to all college presidents or campus CEOs who had not responded. Additional information regarding the study and instruments were provided to participants when requested.

A numerical coding system was used to maintain accurate records. First class mail was used to both send and receive the LEAD-Self and other survey materials. When instruments were returned, the assigned code number was checked against the master list in order to monitor returns effectively. Instruments were scored as soon as they were returned and data were keyed in a computer program for organization and record keeping purposes.

Analysis of Data

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) release 8.0 was used to analyze the collected data. To compare the sample with the population on selected characteristics of community colleges, chi-square tests and t-tests, both at $p < .05$ level of

significance, were used to assess the goodness of the sample. To answer research question one, frequency counts and descriptive statistics were employed to determine the presidents' perceived primary and secondary leadership styles. Style range and style adaptability for each participant were also obtained by the same statistical procedure. To answer research question two, several statistical procedures were applied to determine if there were any possible relationships between community college presidents' leadership styles and the organizational context of their respective institutions. A set of one-way ANOVA tests at the .05 level was completed to determine if there was a significant relationship between community college presidents' primary leadership styles and the following set of institutional characteristics:

- Number of full time faculty
- Percentage budget spent on Liberal Arts/College Transfer
- Percentage budget spent on Vocational Training
- Percentage budget spent on Non-Credit Workforce Development
- Enrollment

A second set of one-way ANOVA tests at the .05 level was undertaken to determine if there was a significant relationship between community college presidents' primary leadership styles and the following personal/personnel characteristics:

- Number of years in present position
- Total number years of experience as a college administrator
- Perceived personal influence on organizational culture
- Perceived personal influence on external community
- Perceived friendliness of work group
- Perceived helpfulness of work group in getting the job done
- Trust in work group

Five chi-square tests were computed at the .05 level to determine if there was a significant relationship between community college presidents' primary leadership styles and the following personal/personnel and institutional characteristics:

- Self-reported decision making style
- Geographical region
- Degree of urbanization
- Type of campus of the respective institutions
- Whether or not there is a collective bargaining agreement in place

Finally, two series of Pearson product-moment correlations were generated to determine if there were relationships between any of the three other leadership characteristics found with the LEAD-Self (i.e., style range, number of secondary styles, and style adaptability) and the organizational context of their respective institutions (i.e., the institutional and personal/personnel characteristics listed above).

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS OF THE STUDY

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to develop a profile of community college presidents' leadership styles. Specific goals of the study were (a) to assess the community college presidents' self-perceived leadership styles; and (b) to examine if there are relationships between self-perceived leadership styles of community college presidents and the organizational contexts of their institutions. The population was comprised of public community college presidents across the nation. Survey instruments were used to identify demographic data about community college presidents and to identify their leadership styles. This chapter presents the survey response rates, a summary of the demographic data, and the research findings. The research questions are answered individually and both tabular and narrative explanations of the analyses are provided. The data received from the participants were analyzed using descriptive statistics, chi-square tests, one-way ANOVAs, and Pearson product-moment correlations. This was accomplished through use of SPSS release 8.0.

Survey Responses

A random sample of 350 participants was selected from the population of 1,271 public two-year or community college presidents across the nation. Questionnaires were mailed to the 350 randomly selected presidents. The mailing contained a demographic questionnaire (DIS) that asked for information about the presidents regarding years employed at their present position, years of college administration experience, self -reported decision making style, and the relationship with their immediate administrators. The demographic questionnaire (DIS) also asked for information regarding the presidents' institutions, i.e., number of full time faculty, single or multi-campus, college instructional priorities, and whether or not there is a collective bargaining agreement in place. Information regarding college size (enrollment), location (degree of urbanization), and region were obtained from the Internet data file (URL = http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/ic.html) containing institutional characteristics of postsecondary institutions that is available from the National Center of Education Statistics. Of the 350 mailed surveys, 176 or 51% were returned. Since the cover letter in the mailing requested voluntary participation, the participants could choose not to answer any of the items in the survey questionnaire. Of the 176 respondents, 13 responded to the demographic questionnaire but left the LEAD-Self blank. One hundred and sixty-nine demographic questionnaires were usable which is a 48% response rate. For the LEAD-Self, 163 were usable and resulted in a 47% response rate.

Descriptive Information

The participants in the study were community college presidents from across the nation. The chief executive officers in community colleges have a wide range of titles. These titles varied from president, vice president, chancellor, dean, superintendent, to director, and principal. Of the 169 participants who responded to the demographic questionnaire (DIS), 124 (73.37%) were titled presidents, 19 (11.24%) directors, 11 (6.5%) superintendents, 5 (2.96%) chancellors, 3 (1.78%) deans, 1 (0.6%) vice president, 1 (0.6%) CEO, and 1 (0.6%) principal. Table 1 shows the titles of the respondents.

Table 1

Official Titles of the Respondents

Title	n	%
President	124	73.37
Vice President	1	.60
Director	19	11.24
Dean	3	1.78
Superintendent	11	6.50
Chancellor	5	2.96
Principal	1	.60
CEO	1	.60
Other	4	2.37
Total	169	100.00

Out of 169 respondents to the demographic questionnaire, 104 were from institutions that consisted of a single campus and 63 were from multi-campus institutions.

Of the 63 multi-campuses, 48 had two or three campuses and 15 had more than four campuses (see Table 2).

Table 2

Number of Campuses at the Respondents' Institutions

Number of Campuses	n	%
1	104	62.28
2-3	48	28.74
4-13	15	8.98
No response	2	0.00
Total	169	100.00

Respondents described their own decision- making style by answering one of the questions on DIS. The question provided four options which were supposed to represent four decision-making styles, Telling (S1), Selling (S2), Participating (S3), and Delegating (S4) for respondents to select the one(s) that best describe their decision-making style. The statistics for decision-making style as reported by the respondents are summarized in Table 3. The respondents who reported themselves as participative (S3) decision-makers numbered 83 (49.7%) and those who reported themselves as delegative (S4) decision-makers totaled 56 (33.5%). The number of the respondents who reported themselves as selling (S2) decision-makers was 8, (4.8%), and telling (S1) decision-makers, 2 (1.2%).

Eighteen respondents selected two options and are reported as having a combination of style. The number of the respondents who reported themselves as

participative/delegative (S3/S4) decision-makers was 13 (7.8%); selling/participative (S2/S3) decision-makers, 2 (1.2%); telling/participative decision-makers (S1/S3), 1 (0.6%); and selling/delegative (S2/S4) decision-makers, 1 (.6%) (see Table 3).

Table 3

Self-Reported Decision-Making Style on Demographic Information Sheet

Decision-Making Style	n	%
Telling (S1)	2	1.2
Selling (S2)	8	4.8
Participating (S3)	83	49.7
Delegating (S4)	56	33.5
Participative/Delegative (S3/S4)	13	7.8
Selling/Participative (S2/S3)	2	1.2
Telling/Selling (S1/S2)	1	.6
Telling/Participative(S1/S3)	1	.6
Selling/Delegative (S2/S4)	1	.6
No Response	2	0.0
Total	169	100.0

Comparison of Respondent Sample with Population

After the data were collected, the first step in their analysis involved comparing the sample data with the population to assess the goodness or representativeness of the sample. One of the selected characteristics of community colleges was location (degree of urbanization).

Based on the NCES definitions of degree of urbanization, the population was compared to the respondent sample on the variable, location (degree of urbanization).

The resulting chi-square test showed that no significant difference was found, χ^2 (6, $\underline{N}$ = 175) = 6.98 (see Table 4).

Table 4

Comparison of Respondent Sample with Population on Degree of Urbanization

Location (Category of Urbanization*)	Population Values n = 1271[a]		Sample Values n = 176		Test Statistic
	f	%	f	%	
Larger City	124	9.9	23	13.1	
Mid-size City	294	23.3	40	22.9	
Urban Fringe of Large City	220	17.4	37	21.1	$\chi^2 = 6.98^{NS}$
Urban Fringe of Mid-size City	89	7.1	8	4.0	
Large Town	58	4.6	14	8.0	
Small Town	367	29.1	44	25.1	
Rural	105	8.3	9	5.1	
Missing	14		1		
Total 1257			176		

NS - Not Significant at α = .05 level, * - Significant at α = .05 level.
*Locale Codes - Category of urbanization used by NCES (April, 1998).
[a]$\underline{n}$ =1271 - This is the total n, however, some cases are missing on several of the different characteristics studied.

The second selected characteristic of community colleges was percentages of minority students. When the sample means of percentage students who are African Americans, percentage students who are American Indians/Alaskan Natives, percentage students who are Asian/Pacific Islanders, and percentage students who are Hispanics were compared to the means of those characteristics in the population, no significant differences were found, $\underline{t} = .13$, $\underline{p} > .05$, $\underline{t} = .98$, $\underline{p} > .05$, $\underline{t} = 1.23$, $\underline{p} > .05$, $\underline{t} = .12$, $\underline{p} > .05$, respectively (see Table 5).

Table 5

Comparison of Respondent Sample with the Population on Percentages of Minority Students

Percentage of Minority Students	Population Values $\underline{N} = 1271^{a}$	Sample Values $\underline{n} = 176$	Test Statistics
African American	$\underline{M} = 12.22$ $\underline{SD} = 15.72$	$\underline{M} = 12.39$ $\underline{SD} = 16.98$	$\underline{t} = 0.13^{NS}$
American Indian/ Alaskan Native	$\underline{M} = 2.49$ $\underline{SD} = 10.42$	$\underline{M} = 1.93$ $\underline{SD} = 7.62$	$\underline{t} = 0.98^{NS}$
Asian/Pacific Islander	$\underline{M} = 3.02$ $\underline{SD} = 7.05$	$\underline{M} = 2.64$ $\underline{SD} = 4.10$	$\underline{t} = 1.23^{NS}$
Hispanic	$\underline{M} = 6.92$ $\underline{SD} = 12.86$	$\underline{M} = 8.45$ $\underline{SD} = 14.68$	$\underline{t} = 0.12^{NS}$

^{NS} - Not Significant at $\alpha = .05$ level, * - Significant at $\alpha = .05$ level.

The third selected characteristic of community colleges was numbers of students enrolled at the institution. When the enrollment-related population mean was compared

to the mean of the respondent sample, no significant difference was found, $t = -.39$, $p > .05$ (see Table 6).

Table 6

Comparison of Respondent Sample with Population on Student Enrollment

Enrollment	Population Values N = 1271[a]	Sample Values n = 176	Test Statistic
Numbers of	M = 4531.52	M = 4380.33	
Students enrolled	Minimum = 0	Minimum = 0	
at the institution	Maximum = 404289	Maximum = 26686	
	SD = 12459.93	SD = 4897.5	$t = -0.39^{NS}$

[NS] - Not Significant at $\alpha = .05$ level, * - Significant at $\alpha = .05$ level.

According to National Center for Education Statistics (NCES, 1998), community colleges in the United States can be categorized into the following nine different regions (outlying areas were not included in the study):

New England - CT, ME, MA, NH, RI, VT
Mid East - DE, DC, MD, NJ, NY, PA
Great Lakes - IL, IN, MI, OH, WI
Plains - IA, KS, MN, MO, NE, ND, SD
Southeast – AL, AR, FL, GA, KY, LA, MS, NC, SC, TN, VA, WV
Southwest – AZ, NM, OK, TX
Rocky Mountains – CO, ID, MT, UT, WY
Far West – AK, CA, HI, NV, OR, WA
Outlying Areas – AS, FM, GU, MH, MP, PR, PW, VI (A-3)

The fourth selected characteristic of community colleges was geographical region. The comparison of the population with the respondent sample on the variable, region, yielded a non-significant chi-square value, χ^2 (7, N = 176) = 5.14 (see Table 7).

Table 7

Comparison of Respondent Sample with Population on Region

Region*	Population Values N = 1271[a]		Sample Values n = 176		Test Statistic
	f	%	f	%	
New England	46	3.6	9	5.1	
Mid East	120	9.4	16	9.1	
Great Lakes	158	12.4	15	8.5	
Plains	143	11.3	15	8.5	$\chi^2 = 5.14^{NS}$
Southeast	437	34.4	59	33.5	
Southwest	144	11.3	26	14.8	
Rocky Mountain	45	3.5	5	2.8	
Far West	177	13.9	31	17.6	

^{NS} - Not Significant at $\alpha = .05$ level, * - Significant at $\alpha = .05$ level.
*Regions are defined by U. S. Department of Education (NCES, April 1998)

The results of the preceding five t-tests and two chi-square tests showed that there were no significant differences between the sample and the population. These results serve to help validate the goodness or representativeness of the sample.

Analysis of Research Questions

Two major research questions were used to guide the investigation. The results obtained relative to each of those questions are described below.

Research Question 1: What is the profile of community college presidents' self-perceived leadership styles as determined by their responses to the Leader Effectiveness and Adaptability Description (LEAD)-Self? To answer and analyze this research question, frequency counts were computed for the characteristics of primary leadership styles, style range, number of secondary styles, and adaptability of leadership styles.

The LEAD-Self survey questionnaire contains 12 items with four alternative behavior choices for each item. The selection of these choices, according to Hersey and Blanchard (1988) can be used to determine the perceived leadership styles of community college presidents or campus CEOs. Primary leadership style was determined by counting the number of times a respondent chose S1—High Task/Low Relationship (Telling) Style, S2—High Task/High Relationship (Selling) Style, S3—Low Task/High Relationship (Participating) Style, or S4—Low Task/Low Relationship (Delegating) Style. The category with the highest frequency count represented the primary leadership style. Primary style is the style that one would tend to use most frequently. The quadrant in Hersey's model which has the greatest number of responses is used to indicate a respondent's primary style.

Style range refers to the total number of quadrants in Hersey's model in which respondents reported two or more responses. Style range provides respondents with a sense for how flexible they are in varying the types of behaviors they engage in when attempting to influence others. Three or more responses in a quadrant indicate a high degree of flexibility in the use of behaviors in that quadrant. Two responses in a quadrant

indicate moderate flexibility. One response in a quadrant is not seen as significant and, therefore, it is difficult to predict flexibility into that style.

Secondary or supporting style(s) include the quadrant(s)—other than one's primary style quadrant—in which there are two or more responses. These styles tend to be one's "back-up" styles when he/she is not using his/her primary style. Number of secondary styles indicates the number of the back-up styles reported by the respondents other than their primary styles.

Style adaptability is the degree to which one is able to vary one's style appropriately to the readiness level of a follower in a specific situation. Points are awarded for each alternative action selected in response to the 12 situations provided in the LEAD-Self instrument. The number of points awarded is determined by how well the alternative action selected matches the situation. The use of a point system allows one's Leadership Style Adaptability to be expressed as a score. Based on Hersey's model, the possible adaptability score ranges from 0 to 36. Hersey subdivided the style adaptability score range into three possible subranges: the score range from 30 to 36 indicates a leader with a high degree of adaptability, the score range from 24 to 29 reflects a moderate degree of adaptability, and the range from 0 to 23 indicates a need for self development to improve both the ability to diagnose task readiness and to use appropriate leader behaviors.

Table 8 contains summaries of the frequencies and percentages of each leadership style for the categories of primary leadership styles, style range, number of secondary

styles, and adaptability of leadership style. The mean and standard deviation for style adaptability are also displayed in Table 8.

Table 8

Profile of Community College Presidents' Leadership Styles by LEAD-Self

Characteristics of Leadership Styles	Statistics	Responses: 176[a]				
Primary Leadership Style		(S1) Telling	(S2) Selling	(S3) Participating	(S4) Delegating	Multiple Styles[b]
	f	2	82	58	0	21
	%	1.2	50.3	35.6	0	12.9
Style Range		One	Two	Three	Four	
	f	3	84	67	9	
	%	1.8	51.5	41.1	5.5	
Number of Secondary Styles		Zero	One	Two	Three	Four
	f	16	74	67	18	1
	%	9.1	42.0	38.1	10.2	0.6
Style Adaptability		M = 25.51 (Min. Value = 15, Max. Value = 32) SD = 2.83				
		Need Improvement (0 - 23)		Moderate (24 - 29)	Highly Adaptable (30 - 36)	
	f	31		126	6	
	%	19.0		76.3	3.7	

[a]Of the 176 respondents, 13 did not respond to LEAD-Self questionnaires.
[b]Multiple Styles refer to the respondents who did not have a primary style, but had a double or triple style.

The highest frequency count for perceived leadership style was for the S2, Selling, leadership style. Of the 176 participants, 82 (50.3%) perceived themselves to be S2, Selling leaders. The next highest frequency count for perceived leadership style was for the S3, Participating, style with 58 (35.6%) respondents choosing that style. Multiple styles, which means that the respondents did not have a primary style, but double or triple styles, numbered 21 (12.9%). The S1, Telling, style had a frequency count of 2 (1.2%), and S4, Delegating, style received a frequency count of 0.

Style range refers to the total number of quadrants in which there are two or more responses and is an indication of flexibility. The participating community college presidents or campus CEOs who reported two as their style range numbered 84 or 51.5%. The community college presidents or campus CEOs who reported three as their style range numbered 67 or 41.1%. The community college presidents and campus CEOs who reported four as their style range numbered 9 or 5.5%, and those who have one as their style range numbered 3 or 1.8%.

With regard to the number of secondary styles, 74 or 42% of the participating community college presidents and campus CEOs reported one secondary style. Sixty-seven or 38.1% of the participating community college presidents and campus CEOs reported two secondary styles. The presidents or campus CEOs who reported no secondary styles numbered 16 or 9.1%. The presidents or campus CEOs who reported four secondary styles (the ones who do not have a primary style but have S1, S2, S3, and S4 as their secondary styles) numbered 1 or 0.6%.

Style adaptability is the degree to which one is able to vary one's style appropriately to the readiness level of a follower in a specific situation. Based on Hersey's model, the possible adaptability scores range from 0 to 36. Of 176 participants, the minimum value of style adaptability is 15 and the maximum value is 32. The majority, 126 or 76.3%, of the participating community college presidents or campus CEOs fell into the category of moderate adaptability of leadership style. Thirty-one or 19% of the participants fell into the category of need improvement. The category of highly adaptable numbered 6 or 3.7%.

The second research question focused on the possible relationships between community college presidents' leadership styles and selected institutional and personal/personnel characteristics.

Research Question 2: Are there significant relationships between the self-perceived leadership styles of community college presidents and the organizational contexts at their institutions, where organizational context is operationally defined by the sets of (a) institutional variables and (b) personal/personnel characteristics? These variables are listed in the following:

(a) Institutional Characteristics
    (1) Number of full time faculty
    (2) Single or multi-campus
    (3) Degree of urbanization
    (4) Geographical region
    (5) Approximate annual budget for Liberal Arts/College Transfer, Vocational/Occupational Training, and Non-Credit/Workforce Development
    (6) Whether or not there is collective bargaining agreement in place
    (7) Student enrollment

(b) Personal and Personnel Characteristics
  (1) Number of years at present position
  (2) Total number years of experience as a college administrator
  (3) Self-reported decision making style
  (4) Personal influence on organizational culture
  (5) Personal influence on external community
  (6) Perceived friendliness of work group
  (7) Perceived helpfulness of work group in getting the job done
  (8) Trust in the group

To analyze this research question, a series of one-way ANOVAs were undertaken in which the selected institutional and personal/personnel characteristics were the dependent variables and the leadership style was the independent variable. Since there were only two respondents for the Telling style and there were no respondents for the Delegating style, these two styles were excluded from the computations.

The ANOVA results dealing with the institutional characteristics showed no significant differences between Selling and Participating styles on the dependent variables of number of full-time faculty, $F(1, 176) = .058$, $p > .05$; approximate annual budget allocation for Liberal Arts/College Transfer, $F(1, 176) = .547$, $p > .05$; approximate annual budget allocation for Vocational/Occupational Training, $F(1, 176) = .007$, $p > .05$; approximate annual budget allocation for Non-Credit/Workforce Development, $F(1, 176) = 1.535$, $p > .05$; or student enrollment, $F(1, 176) = 1.22$, (see Table 9).

Table 9

ANOVA Analyses for Institutional Variables

Institutional Variables	M[1]		df	MS Error	F-Value
	S2	S3			
Number of Full Time Faculty	104.94	109.02	1	9391.09	.058[NS]
Percentage Budget Spent on Liberal Arts/College Transfer	27.36	24.18	1	589.43	.547[NS]
Percentage Budget Spent on Vocational Training	41.75	41.32	1	819.87	.007[NS]
Percentage Budget Spent on Non-Credit Workforce Development	10.83	13.82	1	186.50	1.535[NS]
Enrollment	3776.05	2872.26	1	22675145.3	1.22[NS]

[NS] - Not Significant at $\alpha = .05$ level, * - Significant at $\alpha = .05$ level.
[1]S2 – Selling leadership style, S3 – Participating leadership style

The ANOVAs dealing with the selected personal and personnel characteristics indicated there were no significant differences between Selling and Participating styles on the dependent variables of number of years at present position, $F(1, 176) = 1.40$, $p > .05$; total number of years of experience as a college administrator, $F(1, 176) = 1.03$, $p > .05$; personal impact in influencing the organizational culture, $F(1, 176) = 3.19$, $p > .05$; personal impact in influencing the external community, $F(1, 176) = 1.68$, $p > .05$; friendliness of work group, $F(1, 176) = 0.27$, $p > .05$; helpfulness of work group in getting the job done $F(1, 176) = .45$, $p > .05$; or trust in the work group, $F(1, 176) = 1.19$, $p > .05$ (see Table 10).

Table 10

ANOVA Analyses for Personal and Personnel Variables

Personal/Personnel Variables	M^2		df	MS Error	F-Value
	S2	S3			
Number of Years in Present Position	6.94	8.46	1	54.15	1.40^{NS}
Number of Years in College Administration	20.22	21.66	1	67.29	1.03^{NS}
Perceived Personal Influence On Organizational Culture	1.72	1.50	1	0.50	3.19^{NS}
Perceived Personal Influence on External Community	2.30	2.10	1	0.80	1.68^{NS}
Friendliness of Work Group	1.56	1.51	1	0.36	0.27^{NS}
Helpfulness of Work Group in Getting the Job Done	1.35	1.29	1	0.28	0.45^{NS}
Trust in Work Group	1.43	1.33	1	0.30	1.19^{NS}

^{NS} - Not Significant at $\alpha = .05$ level, * - Significant at $\alpha = .05$ level.
[2]S2 – Selling leadership style, S3 – Participating leadership style

To assess whether there was a significant relationship between the variables—(1) self-reported decision making style, (2) location (degree of urbanization), (3) geographical region, (4) single or multi-campus, and (5) whether or not there is collective bargaining agreement in place—and community college presidents' primary leadership

styles, five chi-square tests were computed. The resulting chi-square tests were not significant, χ^2 (6, $\underline{N}$ = 147) = 2.88, $\underline{p} > .05$, χ^2 (12, $\underline{N}$ = 155) = 10.11, $p > .05$, χ^2 (14, $\underline{N}$ = 162) = 15.11, $\underline{p} > .05$, χ^2 (2, $\underline{N}$ = 160) = 0.25, $\underline{p} > .05$, and χ^2 (3, $\underline{N}$ = 154) = 1.87, $\underline{p} > .05$, respectively, which suggest that a significant relationship did not exist between the aforementioned five variables and primary leadership styles.

The results of the preceding ANOVA and chi-square analyses indicate that there were no significant relationships found between primary leadership style and the various institutional variables—number of full-time faculty, single or multi-campus, approximate annual budget appropriation for Liberal Arts/College Transfer, approximate annual budget appropriation for Vocational/Occupational Training, approximate annual budget appropriation for Workforce Development, whether or not there is a collective bargaining agreement in place, or student enrollment. Nor were significant relationships found between leadership style and the personal/personnel variables—number of years at present position, total number years of experience as a college administration, perceived influence on organizational culture, perceived influence on external community, perceived friendliness of work group, perceived helpfulness of work group in getting the job done, trust in work group, degree of urbanization, region, single or multi-campus, and whether or not there is collective bargaining agreement in place.

All of the preceding analyses involving institutional context dealt with primary leadership style as the key characteristic or component of leadership style. At this point a series of correlation analyses were undertaken in order to investigate if there were significant relationships between the selected contextual and personal/personnel variables

and the other aspects of leadership style—style range, number of secondary styles, and style adaptability. The resulting sets of correlations are summarized in Tables 11 and 12.

Table 11

Correlations of Institutional Variables and the Three Other Leadership Style Characteristics

Institutional Variables	Leadership Style Characteristics:		
	Style Range	Number of Secondary Styles	Style Adaptability
Number of Full-Time Faculty	.115^{NS}	.024^{NS}	.105^{NS}
Single or Multi-campus	-.133^{NS}	-.137^{NS}	-.019^{NS}
Approximate Annual Budget for Liberal Arts/College Transfer	.010^{NS}	.110^{NS}	.088^{NS}
Approximate Annual Budget for Vocational/Occupational Training	.025^{NS}	-.046^{NS}	.033^{NS}
Approximate Annual Budget for Non-credit/Workforce Development	.055^{NS}	.034^{NS}	.076^{NS}
Collective Bargaining Agreement	.006^{NS}	.059^{NS}	.040^{NS}
Enrollment	.119^{NS}	.029^{NS}	-.042^{NS}

^{NS} - Not Significant at $\alpha = .05$ level, * - Significant at $\alpha = .05$ level.

All of the values presented in Table 11 are not significant. These results seem to imply that there is no relationship existent between any of the institutional variables and the three designated leadership style characteristics.

As noted earlier, the results of the series of correlations between the three other leadership style characteristics and the selected set of personal/personnel characteristics are summarized in Table 12.

Table 12

Correlations of Personal and Personnel Variables to the Three Selected Leadership Characteristics

Personal and Personnel Variables	Selected Leadership Characteristics		
	Style Range	Number of Secondary Styles	Style Adaptability
Number of Years at Present Position	.051^{NS}	.083^{NS}	-.175*
Total Number Years of Experience as a College Administrator	.000^{NS}	-.035^{NS}	-.075^{NS}
Influencing Organizational Culture of the Institution	-.027^{NS}	-.057^{NS}	-.022^{NS}
Influencing External Community	.046^{NS}	.075^{NS}	-.167*
Friendliness of Work Group	.161*	.070^{NS}	.204*
Helpfulness of Work Group in Getting the Job Done	.178*	.100^{NS}	-.086^{NS}
Trust in the Group	.112^{NS}	.027^{NS}	-.026^{NS}

^{NS} - Not Significant at $\alpha = .05$ level, * - Significant at $\alpha = .05$ level.

With regard to the personal/personnel characteristics of the respondents and their institutions, there were no significant relationships observed between number of years at present position and style range, $r = .051$ or number of secondary styles, $r = .083$. There

was, however, a significant negative relationship between number of years at present position and style adaptability, $r = -0.175$. The significant negative relationship suggests that the longer presidents are at their positions, the lower their style adaptability.

No significant relationships were observed between the variable, total number years of experience as a college administrator, and the leadership characteristics of style range, $r = .000$; number of secondary styles, $r = -0.035$; or style adaptability, $r = -0.075$. At the same time, no significant relationships were found between the variable, influencing organizational culture, and the characteristics of style range, $r = -0.027$; number of secondary styles, $r = -0.057$; or style adaptability, $r = -0.022$.

There were no significant relationships found between the variable, influencing external community, and the leadership characteristics of style range, $r = .046$, and number of secondary styles, $r = .075$. There was, however, a significant negative relationship noted between the variable, influencing external community, and style adaptability, $r = -0.167$. Due to the fact that influencing external community is scored inversely, this negative relationship suggests that community college presidents or campus CEOs who feel that they have the greatest amount of influence on their respective external communities also perceive themselves to be more adaptable in their leadership styles.

Although there were no significant relationship found between perceived friendliness of work group and number of secondary styles, $r = .070$, there were significant positive relationships observed between friendliness of work group and the variables, style range, $r = 0.161$, and style adaptability, $r = 0.204$. The first of these

relationships suggests, due to the fact that friendliness of work group is scored inversely, that community college presidents or campus CEOs who feel they have friendly work groups tend to report a narrower range in their leadership styles. The second relationship suggests, similarly, due to the fact that friendliness of work group is scored inversely, that community college presidents or campus CEOs who feel they have friendly work groups perceive themselves to be less adaptable in their leadership styles.

A significant positive relationship was also observed between the variable, perceived helpfulness of work group in getting the job done and the leadership characteristic of style range, $r = .178$. Due to the fact that this variable is also scored inversely, the significant positive relationship suggests that community college presidents or campus CEOs who feel their work groups are helpful in getting the job done tend to report a narrower range in their leadership styles.

At the same time, no significant relationships were observed between perceived helpfulness of work group in getting the job done and the leadership characteristics of number of secondary styles, $r = .100$, or style adaptability, $r = -0.086$.

Finally, there were no significant relationships noted between the variable, trust within work group and the leadership characteristics of style range, $r = .112$, number of secondary styles, $r = .027$, or style adaptability, $r = -0.026$.

Summary of Findings

The results regarding the first research question indicated that about half of the respondents (50.3%) categorized themselves as S2 (Selling) leaders, about 36% of them

categorized themselves as S3 (Participating) leaders, and two respondents reported themselves as S1 (Telling) leaders. However, none of the respondents reported themselves as S4 (Delegating) leaders. In addition, about 13% of the respondents did not have a primary style but had a double or triple style. The results also indicated that about half (51.5%) of the respondents reported that they had two as their style range while less than half (41.1%) of them reported they had three. However, only 6% of the presidents/CEOs reported that they had four as their style range. The results also revealed that 42% of the respondents reported they had a secondary style, about 38% of them had two, about 10% of them had three, and about 9% of them reported that they did not have a secondary style. Finally, the results indicated that respondents' style adaptability scores ranged from 15 to 32. Most of the respondents (76.3%) fell into the range from 24 to 29 (moderate degree of adaptability). Less than one-fifth (19%) of them fell into the range from 0 to 23, meaning low degree of adaptability, and a need for self development to improve both the ability to diagnose task readiness and to use appropriate leader behaviors. About 4% (3.7%) of them were categorized into the range from 30 to 36, meaning a high degree of adaptability.

The results of the analyses dealing with the second research question indicated that no significant relationships were found between any of the contextual, i.e., institutional and personal/personnel, characteristics and the respondents' primary leadership styles. Pearson product-moment correlations were subsequently used to investigate the relationships between the same sets of institutional and personal/personnel characteristics and the other leadership style indicators generated – style range, number of